DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 445 267 CE 080 776

AUTHOR	McLaughlin, Daniel; Smorodin, Calla; Smorodin, Ted; Timms, Mike
TITLE	The Career Preparation Assessment (Tailored Versions): Results and Analyses from the 1998-1999 Cohort.
INSTITUTION	WestEd, San Francisco, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2000-07-00
NOTE	127p.
CONTRACT	RJ96006901
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Competency Based Education; Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Educational Practices; *Evaluation Methods; *Portfolio Assessment; *Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; Scoring Rubrics; Secondary Education; Standards; *Student Evaluation

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine how the Career Preparation Assessment portfolio (CPA), tailored to be used in local school reform efforts, was implemented in 10 schools in 1998-99. The research was organized and reported using these four clusters of research questions: tailoring the CPA, implementation, student performance and assessment, and whole-school change. The study found that: (1) the tailoring process enabled schools to customize the CPA to their own needs and increase ownership; (2) the tailored CPA can be implemented successfully in schools possessing certain structural characteristics generally associated with schools that are engaged in a whole-school reform; (3) reliable scoring of the CPA requires a commitment to conducting scoring with substantial training; (4) student performance on the tailored CPA was acceptable to implementing teachers; and (5) a strong majority of project teachers believe the tailored CPA is a valuable teaching tool that promotes changes in classroom practice and can support school-wide reform. (Appendices include both original and tailored CPA standards and rubrics, and student, teacher and scorer survey instruments.) (KC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

CE

ED 445 267

The Career Preparation Assessment (Tailored Versions)

Results and Analyses from the 1998–1999 Cohort

July 2000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE 080 776

WestEd

Improving Education through Research, Development and Service

The Career Preparation Assessment (Tailored Versions)

Results and Analyses from the 1998–1999 Cohort

July 2000

Daniel McLaughlin
Calla Smorodin, Ph.D.
Ted Smorodin, Ph.D.
Mike Timms

This document is supported by federal funds from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, contract number RJ96006901. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i
- Introduction i
- Overview of CPA ii
- Methodology ii
- Findings iii
  - I. Tailoring the CPA iii
  - II. Implementation iii
  - III. Student Performance and Assessment vi
  - IV. Whole-school Change ix
- Conclusion x

FULL REPORT 1
- Introduction 1
- Overview of the Career Preparation Assessment 3
- History 5
- Methodology 10
- Findings 13
  - I. Tailoring the CPA 13
  - II. Implementation 16
  - III. Student Performance and Assessment 32
  - IV. Whole School Change 47
- Conclusion 56

APPENDICES 60

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In 1994, WestEd embarked on an effort to develop a scalable, reliable, performance-based assessment that supported systemic reform (particularly reform supported by School-to-Career principles) and improved student achievement. WestEd created a standards-based portfolio of well-defined student tasks called the Career Preparation Assessment portfolio, or CPA, variations of which have been implemented and tested in schools since the 1994-95 school year.

Over the first three years of the CPA's implementation, WestEd saw that the fixed-model approach hindered the portfolio's ability to be accepted by entire faculties and to be integrated into local reform efforts. High school faculties wanted the ability to alter the portfolio's tasks and standards. In response, in the 1998-1999 school year, WestEd developed a model for tailoring the CPA's standards and components to meet local needs.

The power of the tailored CPA is fourfold:

1. The tailoring process and use of the portfolio improves teachers' expertise in and commitment to teaching and assessing standards.
2. The portfolio's interdisciplinary nature creates the basis for comparison of student work and tasks across a school's curriculum, thereby providing a vehicle for all teachers to look at students in terms of school-wide, versus a single discipline's, student outcomes. Concomitantly, the portfolio's interdisciplinary nature encourages teachers to collaborate across disciplines so that students attain those school-wide outcomes.
3. Unlike many school-wide assessments (e.g., standardized tests), teachers play a major role in selecting and constructing this assessment. The teacher role increases the likelihood that they will use performance data from across the curriculum to inform their teaching.
4. Because the value of the portfolio as a whole is greater than the sum of its parts and because it focuses on skills needed for life after high school, students become more motivated to achieve the portfolio's standards.

Study of, and support for, the CPA aligns closely with WestEd's approach to its national specialty area of assessment—improving student performance and bolstering whole-school change through focus on four priority areas: whole-school implementation, School-to-Work transition, teacher assessment and certification, and development and use of scoring rubrics.

This executive summary is organized by four clusters of research questions about use of the tailored CPA by ten schools in 1998-1999: (1) Tailoring the CPA, (2) Implementation, (3) Student performance and assessment, and (4) Whole-school change. The four clusters inform judgements about the tailored CPA's scalability and potential for impact on students and schools.

Overview of the CPA

In its initial development, the CPA was an interdisciplinary, performance-based assessment of California's Career Preparation Standards (CPS). These standards set out the following skills critical to success after high school, whether in post-secondary education or in the workplace: Thinking and Problem-Solving, Communication, Technology Literacy, Personal; Interpersonal, Occupational Safety and Employment Literacy.

The fixed-model CPA portfolio's structure contains a set of cumulative tasks compiled by students during one or more semesters. It includes such tasks as a resume, a writing sample, a personal statement, and work samples. The tasks are flexible, so students can complete them in academic and/or career-technical education classes. Schools piloted the CPA in 1994, 1995, 1996, 1998 and 1999.

During the 1998-1999 school year, WestEd's goal was to broaden the CPA's scalability through the tailoring process. Ten high schools entered into partnerships with WestEd to develop and pilot a tailored portfolio design, giving them a key opportunity to alter the CPA to their own needs and standards, including designing portfolio guidelines for their students that define the portfolio's standards and tasks, and contain the scoring rubric. Some 1,900 students from grades 9-12 participated, with the number of juniors/seniors being slightly larger than freshmen/sophomores. Eighty-six teachers participated.

In four schools, students completed substantial numbers of portfolios and full-blown scoring sessions. A fifth school took the intermediate step of creating benchmark portfolios to serve as exemplars in the classroom and in professional development activities. Three postponed in-depth CPA implementation until the 1999-2000 school year, but did not implement it then. Two schools did not implement the CPA in any meaningful way in 1998-1999 and did not participate in the 1999-2000 school year. Eight schools implemented the tailored CPA in 1999-2000. As a group, these schools were more successful than the previous cohort. Only preliminary data about the 1999-2000 group are available for this report.

Methodology

Data Sources and Instruments:

- student portfolios from four schools in the 1998-1999 cohort (student portfolios from the 1999-2000 cohort were scored, but serve as a limited data source for the report)
- scorer evaluations
- WestEd staff observations of scoring sessions
- teacher surveys from eight schools (response rate of 68.6 percent)
- interviews with teachers and principals/lead teachers
- student survey from seven schools (response rate of 60.2 percent)
- interim progress reports submitted to OERI

Approach: Data were aggregated by schools in which the portfolio completion rate was high enough to warrant scoring and those in which it was too low to score meaningfully. This was done because high completion rate schools can be termed "successful," and much of what this report is about is identifying key success factors that influence scalability and impact. Furthermore, high completion rate (HCR) schools performed similarly to one another in terms of survey responses and other indicators. Correspondingly, low completion rate (LCR) schools performed similarly to one another. Four schools were HCR and six schools were LCR. Two of the six LCR schools failed to implement the CPA beyond very minimal levels and are excluded from analyses.

Findings

I. Tailoring the CPA

Tailoring is a collaborative effort to customize the CPA, involving representatives of the school community, with WestEd staff acting as facilitators. Teachers, administrators, and community members work together to complete the following fundamental steps:

- Analyze the original CPA portfolio standards (CPS) and the school's own interdisciplinary standards or student outcomes in order to identify overlaps and differences.
- Revise the CPS and the CPA scoring rubric to include local standards that are appropriate for measurement in a portfolio and to remove any unwanted CPS.
- Alter the existing CPA portfolio structure so that the tasks elicit substantial student work relating to the revised standards.

Does the Tailoring Process Increase Teacher Buy-in?

Interviewers asked teachers whether the tailoring process mattered to them and to other teachers. All interviewees responded positively to this line of questioning. The benefits teachers saw for themselves and others were: improved buy-in and ownership, relevance to the school and community, and relevance to the program. Data indicate that teachers, who did not participate in the tailoring process, and the accompanying professional development, did not have as much ownership of the CPA as did those who actually worked on tailoring the document.

II. Implementation

What Are the Key Conditions for Successful Implementation of the CPA?

Prior to presenting data and analyses about this question, it is important to note that implementing portfolios school-wide at the high school level, and particularly in large, traditionally structured high schools, has proven to be quite difficult. Few high schools can generate the teacher buy-in to try, and even those find the curricular and logistical issues (communicating the portfolio's purpose, explaining content and performance standards to students, coordinating portfolio tasks across disciplines, professional development, portfolio storage, setting up scoring sessions, etc.) daunting.

Factors that contributed to the success of classroom implementation: Teacher surveys explored the question by asking respondents to identify what they saw as the five most important factors or resources that contributed to the success of the CPA in their classrooms during the 1998-1999 school year. In **LCR** schools, the factors most often selected as contributing to "success" were:

- experience with standards (55 percent)
- school support of standards (52 percent)
- significant numbers of students in common (38 percent)
- student guidelines (36 percent)
- professional development related to the CPA (36 percent)

In **HCR** schools, the "success" factors most often selected were:

- significant numbers of students in common (65 percent)
- team teaching (59 percent)
- integrated curriculum (58 percent)
- block scheduling (41 percent)
- career academies (41 percent)

The data are characterized by their differences between the two groups. With the exception of "significant numbers of students in common with other teachers using the CPA," the selections by teachers in the LCR schools were substantially different than those by teachers in the HCR schools. This can be explained in part by examining the structure of the four HCR schools. They share some common features: School-to-Work focus, integrated curriculum, and significant numbers of students in common. In essence, *the factors selected by teachers in HCR schools are related to the structures of their schools and, in particular, structures that permit and require the cooperation of teachers across disciplines for a common cohort of students*. It must also be noted that the enabling structures at the HCR schools are mostly present in schools that can be characterized as "reforming."

Schools' ability to set up and implement portfolio scoring: Eighty-seven percent of the respondents expressed confidence that the school would be able to effectively conduct scoring/benchmarking next year without assistance/training from WestEd staff. However, WestEd staff noted that assembling scorers challenged most schools. More than 90 percent of respondents who completed scorer surveys felt the content of the training and the time devoted to training for scoring/benchmarking the portfolios was adequate.

Did Teachers and Students Value the CPA?

Teacher and student perceptions of the benefits of the CPA: Teachers and students saw many benefits to the CPA. During interviews with teachers, respondents were asked to cite the primary purpose of the CPA. The most frequent response was that it benefited students. There was strong agreement among HCR and LCR teacher survey respondents that the skills upon which the CPA was based represented skills valued by both employers and post-secondary institutions (98 percent and 100 percent). Students also agreed (78 percent to 85 percent). Students and teachers in HCR and LCR schools were least optimistic about the actual completed portfolio's value to post-secondary institutions (54 percent to 67 percent agreed). Survey data indicate that HCR students and teachers were consistently more positive than LCR students and teachers.

Interviews with teachers and principals/lead teachers elicited comments about the CPA's impact on students. In addition to the feeling that the CPA would help with access to jobs and college, teachers and principals/lead teachers believed there was an intrinsic benefit to students. They pointed to the pride students took in completing their entries, the sense of achievement they gained as they demonstrated mastery of the skills, and the personal growth that occurred as a result of the reflective component of the CPA. Some respondents also commented on the stress that the portfolio imposed on students, but they felt that this would be alleviated in the future by beginning implementation earlier in the school year.

How Can the Implementation of the CPA be Improved?

Teachers' surveys explored the question by asking teachers to identify what they saw as the five most important factors or resources that **would** have made the CPA more successful. In other words, teachers identified the resources they did not have (or have enough of) but thought would have been useful.

The top five factors for **LCR** schools were:

1. More teacher experience with the CPA (50 percent)
2. Students with more experience with portfolios (43 percent)
3. More school-wide support of the CPA (43 percent)
4. More class time for the CPA (38 percent)
5. More professional development related to the CPA (31 percent).

The top six factors for HCR schools were:

1. More teacher experience with the CPA (59 percent)
2. Students with more experience with portfolios (53 percent)
3. More school-wide support of the CPA (29 percent)
4. More school-wide support of the standards (29 percent)
5. More experience with the standards (29 percent)
6. Integrated curriculum (29 percent)

Student surveys solicited opinions on how to improve the implementation of the CPA. In the LCR schools, "more examples" received the highest number of student responses (40 percent); in the HCR schools, the highest number of student responses (52 percent) was "more class time." It is evident that in both LCR and HCR schools, a sizable number of students reported they did not get all the information, help, and support they needed: 35 percent in the LCR schools and 23 percent in the HCR schools.

Did Teachers Receive Appropriate Support to Develop and Implement a CPA Tailored to Their Schools' Needs and Standards?

Overall, more than 90 percent of the HCR teachers reported that the WestEd workshops prepared them adequately to implement the CPA in their classrooms. Nearly one-fourth of LCR teachers reported they were not well prepared to implement the CPA. Teachers were asked during interviews about ways to improve the professional development provided by WestEd. Half of the respondents cited issues that can be grouped under a category called "leadership." This includes communicating expectations to teachers and students, communicating rewards and consequences, and conducting more follow-up. Half of the teachers interviewed had no suggestions for improving the professional development.

III. Student Performance and Assessment

The primary data sources are the results of the scoring of 287 portfolios at four schools in the spring of 1999 and questionnaires from scorers.

The Scoring Process

In an ideal scoring session, scorers would have a lengthy training followed by a series of pre-scored "calibration" portfolios that they would have to score accurately before being allowed to proceed to independent scoring. Then scorers would periodically stop scoring and recalibrate to ensure that their interpretation of the rubric had not "drifted." The reality for the tailored CPA scoring sessions was different. The total length of time that schools arranged for scoring was only one day, often ending in mid-afternoon. Therefore, lengthy and appropriate training was not possible. In addition to limited training time, it was also not feasible to calibrate scorers.

Teachers, parents, and other community members served as scorers. The scoring sessions began with a brief introduction to the portfolio and the scoring process. Once scorers were familiar with the scoring rubric and the anchor portfolios, they were given a set of three practice portfolios to score and discuss. In most cases training took two hours. In sum, these conditions naturally led to lower-than-desired reliability. Schools implementing tailored portfolios in the 1999-2000 school year scored under better conditions and achieved higher reliability.

Performance levels and rubric dimensions: Each school used three levels of performance to give scores on the dimensions of the rubric and an overall score, typically "Basic," "Proficient," and "Advanced." Because the portfolio guidelines and scoring rubrics had been tailored to the assessment priorities of each school, there was some variation in the dimensions of student performance being assessed. However, all schools addressed dimensions related to career preparation, technology, analysis, and communication.

How reliable were the tailored portfolio as assessments?

In our analyses, inter-rater reliability was calculated in two ways: first, in terms of exact agreement within a scoring level, and second, allowing agreement across main performance levels by use of the plus and minus scores. Under the first method, scores were counted as agreeing if they were in the same performance level. For example, scores of Proficient minus and Proficient plus would count as agreement, but Basic plus and Proficient minus would not, even though Basic plus and Proficient minus are "closer" together than Proficient minus and Proficient plus.

Under the second method, scores with exact agreements and scores of plus on one level and minus on the level above were regarded as agreeing. For example, Basic plus and Proficient minus were counted as agreeing, but Basic plus and Proficient were not. Figure A shows the inter-rater reliabilities for the overall portfolio (versus dimensional) scores under each method, and the range of inter-rater reliabilities calculated for individual scorers. The reason for using two methods was to see if the use of plus and minus scores improved the agreement of scorers when scorers were divided across performance levels, but close (e.g., Basic plus and Proficient minus).

Figure A: Inter-rater reliability of overall scores

	Inter-rater Reliability (method one, agreement within a level)		**Inter-rater Reliability (method two, agreement within a plus or minus)**	
School	Overall %	Min/Max IRR per scorer %	Overall %	Min/Max IRR per scorer %
Drake	57.89	33.3 / 83.3	66.67	33.3 / 83.3
New Technology	68.38	38.9 / 84.2	73.5	39.5 / 85.8
Peoria	69.51	25.0 / 100.0	75.61	25.0 / 100.0
San Leandro	51.47	30.8 / 100.0	52.94	30.8 / 100.0

Inter-rater reliabilities were not as high as desirable, but were understandable given the difficult scoring conditions. Using method two, where score agreements are allowed across the level boundaries, produced slightly higher reliabilities. Using method one inter-rater reliabilities ranged from 57.89 percent to 69.51 percent. Using method two they ranged from 52.94 percent to 75.61 percent. Reliabilities for individual scorers varied greatly, as opposed to scorers at a given school taken as a group.

As a whole, reliability data suggest that improving scoring conditions is necessary for the portfolio to be used in high-stakes environments. However, it is likely that via increased training time and other steps, reliability could increase so that high-stakes use of the portfolio is appropriate, as part of a multiple-measure system. Critically, current levels of reliability may not significantly impact scalability—no 1998-1999 schools indicated that lower than desired reliability would decrease implementation. In fact, HCR schools generally expanded implementation.

Increasing reliability

While no definitive data exist about why reliability was lower than desired, or why it varied across schools, WestEd staff hypothesize that adhering to the following scoring procedures would substantially increase reliability:

- Longer training.
- Target training to dimensions of the rubric that had the lowest inter-rater reliabilities.
- Examine the wording of dimensions of the rubric that had the lowest inter-rater reliabilities and rewrite where appropriate.

In 1999-2000 scoring sessions, implementing those procedures resulted in increased reliability (a range of 64 percent to 79 percent in 1999-2000 versus a range of 58 percent to 71 percent in 1998-1999).

How Well Did Students Perform?

In the simplest assessment of student performance, 68 percent of students who completed portfolios "passed," or received a Proficient or Advanced score, and 32 percent "failed" or received a Basic. In three of the schools, the majority of scores fell within the Proficient category. When considering the strength of these scores, the reader should know that only "complete" portfolios (versus incomplete or portfolios where not all entries were done) were scored. This is important as quality correlates with completeness—students with the skills and attitudes to complete a portfolio typically submit higher quality entries than those that do not complete portfolios.

The distribution of scores across the four schools was fairly similar, with the exception of Peoria. (Peoria had 58.9 percent Basic, as opposed to an average of 23.2 percent for the other three schools.) Excluding Peoria, the range of Basic was 17.4 percent to 30.2 percent; Proficient 51.8 percent to 58.1 percent; and Advanced 11.8 percent to 26.4 percent. In comparison to the 1996-97 cohort, the overall percentage of Proficient scores was the same at 50 percent. Basic and Advanced percentages were also similar.

While the number of schools, students, and portfolios participating in 1996-97 and 1998-1999 is not large, data suggest that schools possessing the factors for successful implementation identified in 1996-97 and confirmed in 1998-1999 might expect student performance to fall within the ranges seen in 1996-97 and 1998-1999.

IV. Whole-school change

What is the Impact of the Tailored CPA on Teacher and School Practices?

More than 70 percent of teachers in both LCR and HCR schools reported they engaged in the following teacher practices: (1) they made substantial use of the standards to structure their curriculum, (2) they made substantial changes in their teaching methods as a result of using the standards, and (3) they made substantial changes in their teaching methods as a result of using the CPA. Teachers in HCR schools attributed more changes in their teaching practices to the CPA and students' efforts for the CPA than did teachers in LCR schools.

The student survey elicited comparative responses about teacher practices. When asked if teachers who use the CPA teach differently than non-CPA teachers, 46 percent of LCR students agreed or strongly agreed. At HCR schools, 68 percent agreed or strongly agreed and the percent of students that strongly agreed was triple that of the LCR schools. When asked if CPA teachers gave different assignments than non-CPA teachers, 52 percent of LCR students agreed/strongly agreed and 64 percent of HCR students agreed/strongly agreed.

What is the Impact of the CPA on Teacher Understanding of Standards-Based Teaching, Assessment, and Portfolios?

Data pertaining to the question come from interviews with teachers and principals/lead teachers. Nine of the 16 teachers interviewed reported the CPA had no impact on their understanding of standards-based teaching, assessment, and portfolios because they came into the program with a high level of understanding in each of the areas. The remaining seven teachers reported they had experienced personal growth and understanding and specifically mentioned a deeper understanding of assessment and the relationship between standards and performance. All of the principals/lead teachers interviewed felt the teachers in their schools had a greater understanding of standards-based teaching, assessment, or portfolios.

What is the Impact of the CPA on Whole-school change, Particularly in Schools with Traditional Structures?

Teacher surveys indicate there is general agreement in LCR and HCR schools that the CPA is valuable for implementing standards-based curriculum and assessment school-wide. Teachers in HCR schools, however, appear to feel much more strongly about the CPA as a valuable support for implementing standards-based curriculum and assessment school-wide (HCR 47 percent strongly agree, LCR 15 percent strongly agree).

In summary, there was general agreement in LCR and HCR schools that the CPA is a valuable tool for implementing standards-based curriculum and assessment school-wide. However, in terms of actually causing, versus supporting, substantial change in structures, procedures, or curriculum, teachers were less conclusive. It appears that in LCR schools, teachers that bought in to the CPA did make changes. LCR teachers that did not buy in, and they appeared to be the majority at LCR schools, did not make changes. At HCR schools, deep structural and classroom changes were less likely as they already had enabling structures in place.

CONCLUSION

The 1998-1999 CPA effort generated data about the potential of the tailored version of the CPA to be used as a scalable, reliable assessment that supports systemic reform. Like the whole of this report, the conclusion is organized around the four research areas of tailoring, implementation, student performance and assessment, and whole-school change.

Tailoring

1. The tailoring process enabled schools to efficiently customize the CPA to their own needs, thus increasing ownership or "buy-in."
2. The tailoring process appears to have ongoing substantive, in addition to buy-in, value.
3. The tailoring process did not place undue burden on schools.
4. Tailoring is integral to long-term scalability due to its impact on buy-in and implementation.

Implementation

1. The tailored CPA can be implemented successfully in schools possessing certain structural characteristics generally associated with schools that are engaged in whole-school reform. HCR schools possessed a preponderance of these conditions while LCR schools possessed few. Four schools started the CPA in the 1999-2000 school year and were chosen with more emphasis on the structural characteristics listed below than the schools chosen for 1998-1999. All four could be characterized as HCR and will continue to implement in the 2000-2001 school year. The key characteristics are:

   - recognition of the benefit of standards-based teaching and assessment for students
   - strong teacher buy-in for the CPA as the right vehicle to implement standards-based teaching and assessment
   - strong school leadership
   - commitment to reform
   - whole-school focus by teachers (as opposed to strong focus on individual departments)
   - integrated curriculum
   - interdisciplinary/team teaching
   - block scheduling
   - a shared cohort of students

2. In CPA pilot tests over four years these conditions were most prevalent in small schools, or smaller units within schools (e.g., academies, career paths). This suggests that the CPA is most sustainable and scalable in smaller learning environments.
3. Like other substantial assessment and curriculum tools that require schools to be well down the reform path, the CPA is not likely to be scalable across a majority of high schools given the current reform status of most high schools.
4. As in 1996-1997, survey and interview data from teachers and students were positive about the value of the CPA.
5. Scoring large numbers of portfolios challenges schools' ability to provide scorers and could impact scalability.

Student Performance and Assessment

1. Reliable scoring of the tailored CPA requires a commitment to conducting scoring with substantial training.
2. Student performance on the tailored CPA was acceptable to implementing teachers.

Whole-school change

1. A strong majority of 1998-1999 project teachers believe the tailored CPA is a valuable teaching tool that promotes change in classroom practice and can support school-wide reform.
2. The tailored CPA allowed and supported "ready" schools to implement their visions related to having a school-wide student performance focus and to standards-based teaching and learning.

The capacity of any school not possessing a preponderance of the CPA's conditions for success to implement any type of standards-based reform on a school-wide basis is highly questionable. Given that, the fact that the CPA did not fare well in LCR schools should not be surprising or disconcerting. Moreover, that the CPA is flourishing in schools with faculties acutely attuned to innovation, and in schools possessing the conditions for success is strong testimony to its value. In our national context where precious few high schools are implementing standards-based reform in more than a few departments, the CPA is an effective tool to help scale standards-based teaching and learning across whole schools and across ready subsets of schools.

Introduction

Systemic reform aimed at improving student performance requires schools and school systems to change a wide variety of practices. This characteristic compels educators to use practices that facilitate change across multiple dimensions of schooling; for example, teaching and learning, curriculum, assessment, grading, and governance. In 1994, WestEd embarked on an effort to develop a scalable, reliable, performance-based assessment that supported systemic reform (particularly reform informed by School-to-Career principles) and improved student achievement. WestEd created a standards-based portfolio of well-defined student tasks called the Career Preparation Assessment portfolio, or CPA, variations of which have been implemented and tested in schools since the 1994-1995 school year. The original CPA model focused on a fixed set of standards that aligned with other important career-related skills and standards frameworks such as the SCANS report.

Over the first three years of the CPA's implementation, WestEd saw that the fixed-model approach hindered the portfolio's ability to be accepted by entire faculties and to be integrated into local reform efforts. High school faculties wanted the ability to alter the portfolio's tasks and standards. In response, in the 1998-1999 school year, WestEd developed a method for tailoring the CPA's standards and components to meet local needs. WestEd made this move to a tailored CPA in an attempt to increase:

- the pool of schools interested in using the CPA as a high-stakes assessment (tailoring increased teacher buy-in and broadened the CPA's applicability to non-School-to-Work settings),
- educator desire to use performance on the CPA as meaningful data informing systemic change,
- employer desire to use the CPA in hiring decisions, and
- admissions officers' desire to use it in admissions decisions.

The tailoring process, which will be described in detail later in this report, required WestEd to increase the amount of resources it provided to implementing schools. It involved teachers, administrators, and others in the school community, thereby strengthening commitment to the CPA. WestEd viewed this investment as likely to increase, rather than decrease, scalability—without thorough faculty buy-in, any major reform is doomed.

This report is organized by four clusters of research questions about use of the tailored CPA by ten schools in 1998-1999: (1) Tailoring the CPA, (2) Implementation, (3) Student performance and assessment, and (4) Whole-school change. The four clusters all inform judgements about the tailored CPA's scalability and potential for impact on students and schools.

Implementation: This is a critical topic because practitioners considering interdisciplinary, standards-based curriculum and assessment must know more about what it takes to achieve success. Also, to make judgments about the CPA's scalability, it is important to identify key conditions for successful implementation of the CPA as well as teacher and student views about the utility of the CPA.

Student performance and assessment: The quality of the tailored CPA as an assessment tool needs to be understood in order to judge its usefulness as a data source to inform change at the classroom, school, and district levels. Furthermore, analyzing student performance on the CPA will tell much about its utility and implementability as an assessment and a curricular tool.

Tailoring: It is important for practitioners to understand which adaptation and implementation approaches lead to maximum success. Data on the implementation of the tailoring process will help to identify successful strategies for improving teacher and administrator commitment through customizing the CPA to meet local needs of schools and districts.

Whole-school change: The actual impact of the CPA on whole-school change needs to be understood so that the CPA's overall value in the reform context can be described accurately and so that practitioners can make judgments about the need for complementary instruments or procedures.

Study of, and support for, the CPA aligns closely with WestEd's approach to its national specialty area of assessment—improving student performance and bolstering whole-school change through focus on four priority areas: whole-school implementation, School-to-Work transition, teacher assessment and certification, and development and use of scoring rubrics.

Overview of the Career Preparation Assessment

In its initial development, the CPA was an interdisciplinary, performance-based assessment of California's Career Preparation Standards (CPS). These standards set out the following skills critical to success after high school, whether in post-secondary education or in the workplace: Thinking and Problem-Solving, Communication, Technology Literacy, Personal, Interpersonal, Occupational Safety, and Employment Literacy (Appendix A). These standards align with most high schools' own expected student outcomes and with important STW standards frameworks, including those in the SCANS report. The CPA provides a bridge across the theoretically interrelated reform vehicles of STW, standards-driven curriculum and assessment, and integrated curriculum.

The model CPA portfolio's structure, developed by WestEd in collaboration with teachers and employers, contains a set of cumulative tasks compiled by students during one or more semesters. The completed portfolio includes such tasks as a resume, a writing sample, a personal statement, and work samples. The tasks are flexible, so students can complete them in academic and/or career-technical education classes. Because students can demonstrate one or more standards (e.g., problem-solving or communication skills) in almost any class, teachers from all disciplines can support the CPA as a useful tool for standards-based instruction and assessment, as well as a vehicle for supporting whole-school change. The entries are presented in Table 1 on the following page.

The purposes of the CPA are: (1) to foster and assess student achievement of skills critical to success after high school, (2) to bolster standards-driven reform efforts that focus on preparing students for the post-high school world, (3) to provide a foundation for teacher collaboration and interdisciplinary curriculum, and (4) to provide students with a useful tool in applying for either entry-level employment or admission to post-secondary education—a completed CPA portfolio.

THIS SPACE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Table 1: Description of CPA entries

Entry	Description
Personal statement	Students outline their career goals and evaluate their skills.
Resume	Students prepare a one-page resume describing their experiences and skills.
Application	Students obtain and complete an application for employment or continued educational training.
Letter of recommendation	Students obtain a letter of recommendation from someone who knows them well, such as a supervisor, community leader, or teacher.
Work samples	Students select pieces of work demonstrating their mastery of the CPS. Work samples can range from a science experiment to organizing a community event to a statistical analysis of a school-wide survey. (One of the two work samples must address Technology Literacy.)
Writing sample	Students select any document demonstrating their ability to communicate in writing and to reach a conclusion based on supporting information and evidence. Students are evaluated on their writing ability and analytical reasoning. Writing samples can range from a comparative analysis of short stories to a business proposal.
Interpersonal skills evaluation	An evaluation of students' interpersonal skills (team work, leadership, etc.), the ISE is completed by a supervisor or teacher after a work experience, a team project, or a class.
Optional entries	Students may create an additional section in their portfolios and include any of the following: 1) attendance records, 2) transcript with GPA, 3) extra-curricular activities, certificates, and awards, or 4) cover letter. The CPA rubric does not address optional entries.

20

The power of the tailored CPA's approach is fourfold:

1. The tailoring process and use of the portfolio improves teachers' expertise in and commitment to teaching and assessing standards.

2. The portfolio's interdisciplinary nature creates the basis for comparison of student work and tasks across a school's curriculum, thereby providing a vehicle for all teachers to look at students in terms of school-wide, versus a single discipline's, student outcomes. Concomitantly, the portfolio's interdisciplinary nature encourages teachers to collaborate across disciplines so that students attain those school-wide outcomes. Moreover, the CPA's interdisciplinary nature helps build a learning community among teachers that supports school-wide reform. Implementing the CPA promotes a whole-school dialog about student achievement and, in particular, about defining what students should know and be able to do.

3. Unlike many school-wide assessments (e.g., standardized tests), teachers play a major role in selecting and constructing this assessment. The teacher role increases the likelihood that they will use performance data from across the curriculum to inform their teaching.

4. Because the value of the portfolio as a whole is greater than the sum of its parts and because it focuses on skills needed for life after high school, students become more motivated to achieve the portfolio's standards.

History

1994-1995

Development of the CPA began in the winter of 1994 when California's legislature passed AB 198, which mandated schools to report on students' readiness for the world of work. The California Department of Education (CDE) then contracted with WestEd to develop an assessment which: (1) supported high schools' compliance with the new law, (2) aligned with the state's new high school reform vision *(Second to None),* and (3) improved student attainment of the Career Preparation Standards, California's equivalent of the SCANS skills and competencies. The new assessment was to build on and align with WestEd's prior pioneering work with the CDE in the field of performance-based assessment of occupational cluster standards, the Career-Technical Assessment Program (C-TAP).

During the winter of 1994, WestEd staff, in collaboration with educators and employers, designed the entries that comprise the model CPA portfolio, and they compiled the student guidelines that assist students and teachers in completing the entries. WestEd recruited eight schools to pilot test portfolio entries (not the complete portfolio) during the spring of 1995. Nevertheless, students from two of the pilot sites submitted complete portfolios. WestEd staff, pilot test teachers, and employers with experience in entry-level hiring evaluated the more than 2,000 completed portfolio entries, creating a number of portfolios as examples of the "Proficient "and "Advanced" levels for use in teacher training and with students.

In addition to analyzing entries, the following key activities took place:

- WestEd developed and analyzed student and teacher surveys regarding the utility and impact of the CPA. Major findings of the 1994-1995 surveys were that students and teachers found the CPA easy to use, that the CPA was a powerful teaching and learning tool, and that many students saw a clear tie between success with the CPA and preparedness for the world of work.
- The student guidelines for implementing the CPA were revised using data and feedback from pilot test teachers.
- A scoring rubric, aligned tightly with the student work received in the pilot test, was drafted and refined after review by practitioners and employers.
- Dissemination work began aggressively, with presentations at major assessment and systemic reform conferences and a mailing to some 200 targeted high schools.

From the work in 1994-1995, WestEd learned that the CPA had strong potential as an implementable, comprehensive assessment tool that organically promotes curriculum integration and teacher collaboration. Also, the work generated initial data about some preconditions for successful implementation. Schools with supportive structures (integrated curriculum, team teaching, common planning time) and prior experience with performance-based assessment submitted more and higher quality student work. Overall, the 1994-1995 CPA effort helped to prepare WestEd to launch a pilot test of the model where students would be required to create "complete" portfolios where all entries were done. WestEd knew a good deal about what types of schools were likely to succeed at CPA implementation and therefore about what schools to select for that pilot.

1995-1996

In the 1995-1996 school year, state support for the CPA was withdrawn following a major restructuring of the CDE. However, the two schools that submitted complete portfolios in 1994-1995 and one other school from the first year continued to pilot test the CPA with support from WestEd. Some 150 completed portfolios were submitted by the three schools. With support from the U. S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), the portfolios were evaluated, exemplars selected, and modifications to the guidelines, scoring rubric, and professional development were made based on teacher and student surveys and other feedback. Also, teachers from some of these pilot schools provided substantive input into the design of the 1996-1997 pilot test, adding new information about key conditions for successful completion of the CPA portfolio. The 1995-1996 effort, while limited, further readied WestEd to hold a full pilot test where relatively large numbers of teachers and students had a full year to complete portfolios.

1996-1997

The 1996-1997 school year was pivotal for the CPA. Limited pilot testing in 1994 and 1995 had been successful, and informal data gathering suggested that high schools across California were at a beginning readiness level to try a performance-based assessment of generic work readiness skills. WestEd decided to launch a significant test of the CPA across several factors: usability, reliability as an assessment, and impact of use on whole-school change.

The 1996-1997 pilot testing of the CPA was designed to build on development work completed during the prior school years. To start, WestEd identified 300 high schools likely to have interest in, and capacity for, implementing the CPA and invited them to apply for participation in the 1996-1997 pilot test. Twenty-eight schools submitted four-page applications. WestEd selected seven that appeared able to implement well and represented diversity of geography and ethnicity. Key factors in selection were: (1) number of teachers and students who were to participate; (2) teacher experience with performance-based assessment, working in teams, and with integrated curriculum; (3) teacher commitment to implementation; and (4) number of shared students. The quid pro quo for participation in this larger pilot test was that WestEd would provide materials and professional development, while participating teachers and students would submit their portfolios and observations about implementing the CPA to WestEd for analysis.

The selected schools ranged widely in terms of geography, experience with performance-based assessment, and structure. All but one of the schools were ethnically diverse. All schools accepted into the pilot were judged to have the capacity to have their students produce substantial numbers of complete portfolios—no schools were accepted that appeared to lack the fundamentals necessary for completing portfolios. Six schools (one of the original seven schools dropped out prior to the beginning of the 1996-1997 school year), 36 teachers, and over 600 students participated. The six schools received professional development about the CPA from WestEd.

Conducting a substantial field test in 1996-1997 gave WestEd its first fairly complete view into CPA implementation across a range of schools and across schools that were implementing under good circumstances. The data gathered from teachers, students, and the portfolios themselves allowed WestEd to make informed decisions about revising the CPA, requirements for future participation from schools, and teacher training.

1997-1998

During the 1997-1998 school year, WestEd used the 1996-1997 field test findings to revise and refine the implementation process. In particular, WestEd reviewed data indicating that the fixed-model approach hindered the portfolio's ability to be accepted by entire faculties and to be integrated into local reform efforts. This decreased the CPA's potential impact and scalability. High school faculties wanted the ability to alter the portfolio's tasks and standards, even if alterations were largely symbolic in nature. WestEd created a process for tailoring the standards and components that make up the CPA to accommodate schools' needs and standards. Ten high schools were recruited in the spring of 1998 to participate in a two-year trial of the tailored version of the CPA. Participation requirements for this trial were substantially higher than in prior years. Participating schools committed to:

1. work as part of a team with WestEd;
2. have a deep commitment to measuring interdisciplinary standards that relate to the following skills: Thinking and Problem-Solving, Communication, Technology Literacy, Personal, Interpersonal, and Employment Literacy;
3. expend significant resources (4-6 days of release time—for professional development for teachers using the portfolio, to collaborate with WestEd in portfolio design, and to score portfolios) toward making the portfolio a success;

4. have thorough "buy-in" for the portfolio from teachers who will be implementing it;
5. recognize that successful implementation of their portfolio requires a major, sustained effort on the part of teachers and students;
6. implement the portfolio for two years (for example, all 1998-2000 juniors in their junior and senior years); and
7. in the second year of the partnership, place significant stakes on student performance with their portfolio (possibilities include: 50 percent of the grade in multiple classes, graduation requirement, prominent inclusion of performance on transcript).

By the end of 1997-1998, WestEd had a diverse set of schools on board to pilot test the tailored model.

1998-1999

During the 1998-1999 school year, WestEd's goal was to broaden the CPA's scalability through the tailoring process. Ten high schools entered into partnerships with WestEd to develop and pilot a tailored portfolio design, giving them a key opportunity to alter the CPA to their own needs and standards, including designing portfolio guidelines for their students that define the portfolio's standards and tasks, and contain the scoring rubric. The guidelines are designed to be a stand-alone document that provides students with all the information they need to complete the portfolio. Teachers created their schools' guidelines by tailoring the fixed-model CPA guidelines to their school's scoring rubric. All ten schools chose to adopt most of the Career Preparation Standards. WestEd's ongoing professional development activities with partner schools focused on implementation support, preparation for scoring, and the logistics of portfolio storage.

At all ten schools implementation was interdisciplinary, generally by teachers from academic and career-technical disciplines. For example, the personal statement would be completed in English, one work sample in Math and the other work sample in Agriculture. Implementation generally began late in the first semester or early in the second, and continued throughout the year. Some 1,900 students from grades 9-12 participated, with the number of juniors/seniors being slightly larger than freshmen/sophomores. Eighty-six teachers participated. Of the ten schools, three implemented in traditional structures, three in academies, two in academies within a traditional structure, and two in alternative/continuation schools.

Teachers primarily implemented the portfolio as a teaching and learning tool in the 1998-1999 school year, gaining confidence with both the materials and the portfolio development process. They also prepared to add higher stakes to the mix during the second year (1999-2000) when meeting the portfolio's performance standards was to become a graduation requirement or a significant part of students' grades.

In four schools, students completed substantial numbers of portfolios and full-blown scoring sessions were held involving teachers, school and district administrators, school board members, employers, and parents. A fifth school took the intermediate step of creating benchmark portfolios to serve as exemplars in the classroom and in professional development activities. Three postponed in-depth CPA implementation until the 1999-2000 school year, but did not implement then. Two schools did not implement the CPA in any meaningful way in 1998-1999 and did not participate in the 1999-2000 school year.

Completed portfolios typically were scored on site at the end of the school year by a team, usually consisting of teachers and other district personnel. In some cases community members were invited to participate. The team met prior to the scoring for training in the scoring rubric. (See Appendix B for the model CPA rubric; see Appendix C for examples of tailored rubrics; see Appendix D for tailored standards.)

Using tailored scoring rubrics, completed portfolios received an overall rating on a 3-point scale, typically labeled Basic, Proficient, or Advanced. The lowest, or "Basic," rating serves as an indicator that the student has not mastered the specified standards, is not hirable for an entry-level job in a non-technical field, and that the portfolio is not ready to show to an entry-level employer or college admissions officer. The "Proficient" rating is an indicator that the student has mastered the specified standards, is hirable for an entry-level job in a non-technical field, and that the portfolio is ready to show to an entry-level employer or college admissions officer. The highest, or "Advanced," rating is an indicator that the student has strong mastery of the specified standards, is hirable for an entry-level job in a non-technical field, and that the portfolio may exceed the expectations of an entry-level employer or college admissions officer.

1999-2000

For the 1999–2000 school year, WestEd created partnerships with four new high schools to develop and implement tailored portfolios. It maintained partnerships with the four 1998-1999 schools that produced enough portfolios to hold scoring sessions. Thus, a total of eight sites participated in the 1999-2000 school year. The new sites were selected with increased emphasis on structural characteristics identified as key to successful implementation. In all eight schools, students completed substantial numbers of portfolios and full-blown scoring sessions were held involving teachers, school and district administrators, school board members, employers, and parents. WestEd provided the same support for 1999-2000 schools as it did for 1998-1999 schools.

Methodology

Throughout the 1998-1999 school year and into the following summer, WestEd gathered data to analyze the CPA in terms of the four broad research categories delineated earlier: (1) Tailoring the CPA, (2) Implementation, (3) Student performance and assessment, and (4) Whole-school change.

Data Sources and Instruments

Student Portfolios: Students from four 1998-1999 schools (New Technology—Napa, CA; Peoria—Peoria, AZ; San Leandro—San Leandro, CA; and Drake, San Anselmo, CA) completed substantial numbers of CPA portfolios. Portfolio scoring took place at the four schools in late May/early June 1999. WestEd staff provided training and supervised all the scoring sessions, which included teachers who implemented the CPA in their classrooms. Principals and other site administrators participated in some of the scoring sessions, as did district administrators and school board members. Finally, parents and employers from the community participated in scoring at some schools. In the six remaining schools, there was an insufficient sample of completed portfolios to conduct scoring. (Portfolios from the eight 1999-2000 schools were also scored in June of 2000. Only preliminary data are available about these portfolios.)

Scored portfolios were given a score on each of the dimensions defined by the school's scoring rubric (see Appendix B for examples of dimensions on the model CPA rubric: Career Preparation, Analysis, Technology and Communication). Student performance on these dimensions, or sub-categories within the rubric, informed the overall rating of a portfolio. The four schools all had the following dimensions in common: Career Preparation, Analysis, Technology, and Communication. As part of the tailoring process, some schools gave these dimensions different names, and schools added to or modified these dimensions. However, substantively, they were quite similar. In any case, the scoring rubrics contained descriptors of student performance related to one or more of the seven Career Preparation Standards at the Basic, Proficient, and Advanced levels. For example, a descriptor of written communication at the Advanced level is "Writing is clear and well organized throughout the portfolio." The analogous descriptor at the Basic level is "Ideas are presented in a disorganized way."

In three schools, each completed portfolio was scored by at least two different scorers. In one school, a method of scoring was used that inadvertently resulted in some portfolios being scored by only one scorer while other portfolios were scored by three scorers. WestEd's approach to scoring portfolios is more extensive than the scoring procedures generally used with portfolios. In most portfolio scoring systems, only one scorer scores each portfolio. A second scorer then scores a *sample* of the first scorer's portfolios to be sure that the first scorer applied the scoring rubric correctly. Scoring many portfolios multiple times generated rich data, which WestEd used to explore issues related to the reliability with which CPA portfolios could be scored, and how dimension scores related to the overall scores given to portfolios.

The following number of portfolios were scored in 1998-1999 (includes anchor and training papers):

New Tech	81
Peoria	91
San Leandro	78
Drake	64
Total	314

Scorer Evaluations: After the portfolios had been scored, each scorer responded to a one-page questionnaire asking whether the training conducted by WestEd prepared them adequately for scoring and benchmarking student portfolios, whether the training and scoring experience would carry over into future scoring of the CPA, whether the rubric should have three or four score points, and whether participating in scoring was good preparation for helping students produce Proficient portfolios. Scorers' surveys were completed by 65 respondents.

WestEd Observation of Scoring Session: WestEd staff took note of key developments during the scoring session.

Teacher Survey: Near the end of the 1998-1999 school year, teachers in eight schools completed surveys about their experiences with the tailored CPA. The survey focused on the following areas:

- Resources which would have made CPA implementation more successful
- The extent to which the CPA was implemented in the teacher's classrooms
- Overall impressions of the CPA
- The degree to which using the CPA affected teaching methods or curriculum
- The most important factors contributing to the successful implementation of the CPA
- The impact of the tailoring process on teacher commitment (buy-in)
- Implementation, alignment with school standards
- Professional development and training for the CPA
- Other education reform efforts occurring at the school, excluding the CPA
- Work with standards, integrated curriculum, block scheduling, team teaching, and career academies

Teachers responded to most of the items on a Likert-type scale which asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with a statement. Teachers at the eight schools completed 59 surveys for a response rate of 68.6 percent. At two schools, teachers did not complete surveys.

Interviews with Teachers and Principals/Lead Teachers: Telephone interviews were conducted in late May/early June 1999 with the principal or lead teacher from each of the ten schools. In addition, telephone interviews were conducted with 16 teachers from five schools. The purpose of the interviews was to obtain more detailed information about the issues examined in the teacher survey.

Student Survey: Students from seven schools completed a survey near the end of the 1998-1999 school year that gathered information about the following areas:

- their perceptions of the CPA, including their perception of the value of the CPA to employers and colleges.
- how the CPA was implemented in their classrooms. Issues included whether they understood the standards and the CPA, the level of assistance they received from their teachers, and how classrooms where the CPA was used differed from other classrooms.

Most of the items were on a four-point Likert-type scale which asked how strongly students agreed or disagreed with a particular statement. Some items also asked students to explain their responses. A total of 1,144 students responded to the survey for a response rate of 60.2 percent.

In addition to the data sources described above, interim progress reports submitted to the U. S. Office of Educational Research and Improvement were a source of descriptive and anecdotal data about the implementation of the project.

A copy of each data collection instrument may be found in Appendix E.

Approach: Data were aggregated by schools in which the portfolio completion rate was high enough to warrant scoring and those in which it was too low to score meaningfully. This was done because high completion rate schools can be termed "successful," and much of what this report is about is identifying key success factors that influence scalability and impact. Furthermore, high completion rate schools performed similarly to one another in terms of survey responses and other indicators. Correspondingly, low completion rate schools performed similarly to one another. Low completion rate schools will be referred to as LCR; high completion rate schools will be referred to as HCR. Four schools were HCR and six schools were LCR. Two of the six LCR schools failed to implement the CPA beyond very minimal levels and are excluded from this report's analyses—these two schools did not implement enough to have informed opinions about use of the portfolio.

This HCR/CCR approach provides two benefits. First, analyses resulting from the approach informing much of the report's key conclusions about scalability—that the tailored CPA is scalable in schools that resemble HCR schools structurally. Second, it allows the reader through two sets of practitioner's lenses, HCR and LCR.

28

Findings

Findings are organized according to the research categories listed in the Introduction: (1) Tailoring the CPA, (2) Implementation, (3) Student performance and assessment, and (4) Whole-school change.

I. Tailoring the CPA

Tailoring is a collaborative effort to customize the CPA, involving representatives of the school community, with WestEd staff acting as facilitators. Teachers, administrators, and community members work together to complete the following fundamental steps:

- Analyze the original CPA portfolio standards (CPS) and the school's own interdisciplinary standards or student outcomes in order to identify overlaps and differences.
- Revise the CPS and the CPA scoring rubric to include local standards that are appropriate for measurement in a portfolio and to remove any unwanted CPS.
- Alter the existing CPA portfolio structure so that the tasks elicit substantial student work relating to the revised standards.

In the tailoring process, WestEd staff conducted two full days of intensive on-site work at each school with teachers, school and district administrators, and representatives of the school community. They explored, in detail and in practical terms, how they could cooperate across subject areas to make the CPA work to help their students meet carefully designed performance standards. Following the two-day session in each school, WestEd staff revised the CPA guidelines to meet each school's needs and standards. (See Appendix F for an example of tailored CPA guidelines.) Throughout this tailoring process, teachers continually redefined what they wanted students to know and be able to do, which standards should be taught in which classes, and which school structures, such as scheduling or student grouping, needed revision in order to support implementation of a school-wide curricular reform effort.
This section of the report seeks to answer the following questions: (1) How aware were teachers that the CPA had been tailored for their school? (2) Does the tailoring process increase teacher commitment, or buy-in?

How Aware Were Teachers That the CPA Had Been Tailored for Their School?

Teacher surveys and interviews elicited data on teacher awareness of the tailored CPA. From responses to the teacher survey, it was determined that 79 percent of teachers in LCR schools and 100 percent of teachers in HCR schools reported they were aware that the CPA was created or tailored specifically for use in each school through teacher collaboration with WestEd staff. In LCR schools, 21 percent of the teachers said they were unaware that the CPA was created/tailored through such collaboration. Because successful implementation of the CPA requires collegial collaboration, this finding suggests serious communication problems in the LCR school.

Table 2: Percent of teachers who were aware that the portfolio was created/tailored by teachers from their school working with WestEd staff

	LCR (N=38)	HCR (N=14)
Yes	79	100
No	21	0

When asked to judge the awareness of *other* teachers in the school, teachers in both LCR and HCR schools generally thought that from some to almost all of the teachers who used the CPA knew it was created/tailored for use in their school. In LCR schools, however, 9 percent of respondents felt almost none of the other CPA teachers in their school were aware that the CPA was tailored.

Table 3: Percent of teacher responses about the number of other teachers in their school who used the CPA in their classes who were aware that the program was created/tailored specifically for use in their school

	LCR (N=35)	HCR (N=14)
Almost all	31	57
Many	29	0
Some	31	43
Almost none	9	0

The teacher survey also provided data on the percentage of respondents who participated in the tailoring process with WestEd staff. In LCR schools, 57 percent responded in the affirmative; in HCR schools, 79 percent responded that they participated in the process. In the schools where there was more teacher participation in the tailoring process, there was also more school-wide awareness that the portfolio was created or tailored specifically for individual schools.

Table 4: Percent of teachers who participated in the tailoring process

	LCR (N=35)	HCR (N=14)
Yes	57	79
No	43	21

Does the Tailoring Process Increase Teacher Buy-in?

Teachers were asked in interviews about whether the tailoring process mattered to them and to other teachers. All interviewees responded positively to this line of questioning. The benefits teachers saw for themselves and others were: improved buy-in and ownership, relevance to the school and community, and relevance to the program.

Among the comments pertaining to buy-in were the following:

- It is very important. We are a real different school here.
- The opportunity to create helps with buy-in.
- It helped buy-in; it was important we got to choose.
- If it wasn't tailored, we would not have done it. We shaped it for our needs. We don't take anything prepackaged.
- No one would have been happy if we took it the way it was.
- Our CPA was not generic; it was customized.
- I would not have been willing to use the CPA in my class without the opportunity to change, customize, and streamline it.

One teacher in an academy-based school where two of four academies were participating in the CPA expressed concern about lack of ownership among teachers in the two academies that did not participate. "Ownership is a problem," he commented, "because not everyone is on board. The other teachers need to think it is theirs, too."

Comments pertaining to relevance of the CPA to the school and community included the following:

- It reflected our community.
- It was good to use examples from our community.
- Reflects our community and standards.

Among comments pertaining to relevance to the program were the following:

- The process was important; without this opportunity, the program would have flopped.
- It is very important that we have something that works for our site.
- Had we used samples we saw from other schools, it would not have applied to all my students.
- It was important for me that the CPA was aligned with what we are teaching.

Teacher interviews asked for opinions about how to improve the tailoring process. More than half of the respondents felt there were no improvements necessary. Other respondents emphasized the need to begin early in the school year. There were a few comments about the need to work out some mechanical issues pertaining to the portfolios, such as finding ways to demonstrate the skill of student collaboration, use of multi-media, and the need to conserve computer memory. Other comments called for the involvement of more teachers, more administrator support, and considering tailoring the CPA for different "tracks," such as college prep and vocational.

In summary, the opportunity to tailor the CPA to local needs was very well received. Teachers and administrators reported a sense of ownership because the CPA was tailored for their particular school and, more importantly, school personnel were included in the tailoring process. All of the schools renamed the CPA so that it carried the school name in its title. The data indicate that teachers who did not participate in the tailoring process and the accompanying professional development did not have as much ownership of the CPA as did those who actually worked on tailoring the document. In some schools, the implementation plan called for a core group of trained teachers to bring their untrained colleagues on board; this generally was not effective.

Teachers in HCR schools were more likely to feel more aware, more involved, and better prepared than did teachers in LCR schools. HCR teachers gave higher marks to the professional development they received and the quality of the communication from their leadership than did teachers in LCR schools. In addition, teachers in HCR schools reported more personal awareness of the tailoring process and more awareness by other teachers that the CPA was tailored specifically for their schools than did teachers in the LCR schools. Finally, in the HCR schools, there was a greater percentage of teachers who participated in the tailoring process than there was in the LCR schools. Involving more teachers in the tailoring process appears to be important to increasing teacher commitment or buy-in.

II. Implementation

The report seeks to answer the following questions about implementation: (1) What are the key conditions for successful implementation of the CPA? (2) Did teachers and students value the CPA? (3) How can implementation of the CPA be improved? (4) Did teachers receive appropriate support to develop and implement a CPA tailored to their schools' needs and standards?

What Are the Key Conditions for Successful Implementation of the CPA?

Prior to presenting data and analyses about this question, it is important to note that implementing portfolios school-wide at the high school level, and particularly in large, traditionally structured high schools, has proven to be quite difficult. Few high schools can generate the teacher buy-in to try, and even those find the curricular and logistical issues (communicating the portfolio's purpose, explaining content and performance standards to students, coordinating portfolio tasks across disciplines, professional development, portfolio storage, setting up scoring sessions, etc.) daunting. Schools' and WestEd's expectation that large numbers of completed portfolios could be produced in the first year of implementation were demanding. For LCR schools, which lacked many of the structural characteristics that support successful portfolio implementation, the expectation was even more demanding. All schools that took on the CPA challenge should be commended. Also, all schools learned a great deal about implementing portfolios and their capacity to act as a school (versus as a group of departments or as a group of teachers).

Data pertaining to the implementation questions come from teacher and student surveys, interviews with principals/lead teachers, and scorer surveys. The following issues were examined:

- factors that contributed to the success of classroom implementation;
- value of the portfolio guidelines; and
- schools' ability to set up and implement portfolio scoring.

Factors that contributed to the success of classroom implementation: Teacher surveys explored the question by asking respondents to identify what they saw as the five most important factors or resources that contributed to the success of the CPA in their classrooms during the 1998-1999 school year. The survey did not provide a definition of "success," allowing teachers to apply their own definitions. Even if a school was LCR, its teachers still felt that they had some success with the portfolios and therefore were able to answer survey questions about "success." Table 5 presents the survey data.

In **LCR** schools, the factors most often selected as contributing to the "success" teachers had are listed below. (Please note that some schools could not select some of the choices presented by the survey. For example, "block scheduling" was a choice in the survey but not all schools had block scheduling.)

- experience with standards (55 percent)
- school support of standards (52 percent)
- significant numbers of students in common (38 percent)
- student guidelines (36 percent)
- professional development related to the CPA (36 percent)

In **HCR** schools, the "success" factors most often selected were:

- significant numbers of students in common (65 percent)
- team teaching (59 percent)
- integrated curriculum (58 percent)
- block scheduling (41 percent)
- career academies (41 percent)

The data are characterized by their differences between the two groups. With the exception of "significant numbers of students in common with other teachers using the CPA," the selections by teachers in the LCR schools were substantially different than those by teachers in the HCR schools. This can be explained in part by examining the structure of the four HCR schools. They share some common features: School-to-Work focus, integrated curriculum, and significant numbers of students in common. Three of the schools used the academy model for most of the students implementing the portfolio. The fourth is a small high school in which the entire student body participated. In essence, *the factors selected by teachers in HCR schools are related to the structures of their schools and, in particular, structures that permit and require the cooperation of teachers across disciplines for a common cohort of students.* Data from teacher interviews support this hypothesis and suggest that the structures made implementation significantly easier. It must also be noted that the enabling structures at the HCR schools are mostly present in schools that can be characterized as "reforming."

In the LCR schools, there is less uniformity across schools as to structures. Two of the schools are large comprehensive high schools that attempted to implement the CPA across a single cohort of students; e.g., all incoming freshmen. The other two schools are small alternative high schools that receive students from and return them to a comprehensive high school throughout the school year. In these schools, the entire student body participated. In the four LCR schools there was not a significant School-to-Work focus, or integrated curriculum or significant team teaching. The responses of teachers in LCR schools instead focus on factors that were within their own experiential purview: experience with the standards, school-wide support of the standards and the CPA, professional development, and significant numbers of students in common with other teachers using the CPA. The five factors selected by teachers in HCR schools may not be present in LCR schools and are not likely to be selected as responses by teachers in the LCR group.

Teacher interview data also suggest that the enabling structures support teacher buy-in and that that teacher buy-in was influenced by the fact that the CPA was a standards-based tool for instruction and assessment. WestEd staff who worked closely with all the schools indicated that teacher "buy-in" was an essential success factor and that the HCR schools all had it while the LCR schools clearly did not.

Table 5: Percent of teachers selecting factor as important to success of the CPA in their classrooms

	LCR (N=43)	HCR (N=19)
Integrated curriculum	14	58
Previous experience with standards-based assessment	19	24
Previous experience with performance-based assessment	26	24
Block scheduling	10	41
Significant numbers of students in common with other teachers using the CPA	38	65
Team teaching	[illegible]	59
Career academies	12	41
Professional development related to the CPA	36	6
Class time for the CPA	12	18
Experience with the standards	55	12
CPA student guidelines	36	24
Students with more experience with portfolios	19	18
Parent understanding of portfolios	5	6
School-wide support of the standards	52	18
More school-wide support of the CPA	31	12

Interviews with teachers and principals/lead teachers asked them to list the three most important ingredients to successful implementation. Teacher comments emphasized the importance of:

- sufficient time and resources
- leadership and organization
- administrator and staff commitment
- tailoring the CPA
- alignment of instruction and assessment with standards

Principal/lead teacher comments emphasized the importance of:

- organization, communication, responsibility
- teacher commitment and teamwork
- standards alignment
- tailoring the CPA
- time for planning and collaboration

The interviews reinforce the data from teacher surveys indicating that organization and structure relate to cooperation and teamwork. Interviews also suggest that tailoring the CPA was an important ingredient to successful implementation because it fostered a sense of ownership among teachers.

Implementation goals and strategies varied across the eight schools. Generally, they fell into three categories: (1) whole school, (2) one or two teams or academies within the school, and (3) all students within a cohort; e.g., all freshmen.

Table 6 on the next page lays out some of the characteristics of the implementation data.

Table 6: CPA Implementation Data

Characteristics	School								
	Drake	Central#	Sandy#	Main#	Wales#	New Tech	Peoria	San Leandro	TOTAL
School Implementation Strategy *	A	W	C	W	C	W	A-C	A	
Number of Completed Portfolios Scored	84	0	0	0	0	80	82	78	324
Number of Student Participants **	70	100	600 to 700	322	450	200	1000	100	2842
Number of Students Surveyed	30	4	237	160	279	136	306	0	1142
Number of Teacher Participants **	5	20	20 to 25	14	20	11	20	4	114 to 119
Number of Teachers Surveyed	3	7	9	12	13	3	9	1	57
Average Number of Teacher Classes Using CPA	2	1.4	2.8	4.1	2.9	4.3	2.8	3	
Timeline for Introduction of CPS	Sept	Nov - Feb	Sept - Mar	Sept - Oct	Sept - Feb	Sept - Nov	Sept - Mar	Jan	
Timeline for First CPA Entry	Sept - Nov	Nov - Mar	Sept - Mar	Sept -Feb	Sept - Feb	Sept - Nov	Oct - Mar	Jan	

* W = Whole School, A = Academy or Team, C = All Students in a Grade Level

** Source: Principal/Lead Teacher Interview

#=Pseudonym

Value of the CPA guidelines: Teachers and students were asked on their respective survey instruments whether students received the CPA student guidelines. The guidelines define the portfolio's standards and tasks, and contain the scoring rubric. They are designed to be a stand-alone document that provides students with all the information they need to complete the portfolio. Teachers created their schools' guidelines by tailoring the fixed-model CPA guidelines. More than 90 percent of teachers in LCR and HCR schools reported that their students received a copy of the guidelines. There is a substantial difference between students in LCR and HCR schools regarding student receipt of the student guidelines. In LCR schools, 58 percent of the students said they received them, while 71 percent of the students in HCR schools reported receiving a copy. A possible explanation is that teacher distribution of the guidelines was done differently across schools and that some students may not have recognized or remembered receiving guidelines. Generally, in HCR schools, teachers gave students their own individual copies of the student guidelines booklet prepared by WestEd staff. In LCR schools, teachers often gave students excerpts from the guidelines booklet and distributed them from time to time throughout the school year. In the student survey, students were asked about the receipt of a copy of the "Guidelines for Students," implying the receipt of a booklet, not a series of excerpts.

Of those students who reported receiving a copy of the guidelines, 62 percent of students in LCR schools reported that they were helpful and 85 percent of students in HCR schools felt they were helpful. A greater percentage of teachers felt the guidelines were useful than did students. In LCR schools, 84 percent of teachers reported that the guidelines were helpful to students, and in HCR schools, 100 percent of teachers felt the guidelines were helpful. The discrepancy between students in LCR and HCR schools as to the usefulness of the guidelines may be a factor in the CPA completion rate. Data reported later in this report suggest a relationship among teacher buy-in, student performance, and the value teachers place on the CPA. In HCR schools (where completion rates and buy-in are higher than in LCR schools), more teachers place a high value on the CPA than do teachers in LCR schools. It is likely that teachers who place a high value on the CPA also place a high value on the student guidelines.

Table 7: Student and teacher reports about CPA student guidelines

	Teachers		Students	
	LCR (N=41)	HCR (N=16)	LCR (N=673)	HCR (N=471)
Students received guidelines	93%	100%	58%	71%
Guidelines were helpful to students	84%	100%	62%	85%

School's ability to set up and implement portfolio scoring: The four HCR schools each had a sufficient number of completed portfolios to warrant full scoring; a fifth school fell short of being able to conduct scoring, but had a sufficient number of completed portfolios to complete a benchmarking activity. This consisted of identifying a small number of portfolios at each score level to serve as exemplars.

More than 90 percent of respondents who completed scorer surveys felt the content of the training and the time devoted to training for scoring/benchmarking the portfolios was adequate, and that the experience of participating in scoring/benchmarking was valuable. Moreover, 87 percent of the respondents expressed confidence that the school will be able to effectively conduct scoring/benchmarking next year without assistance/training from WestEd staff.

Interviews with principals/lead teachers indicated "no problems" related to setting up the sessions; one principal commented, "It was not nearly as difficult to do as people thought it might be." One principal reported some difficulty in obtaining participation from community representatives; in another school, this did not pose any problems.

The ability to conduct scoring is an important component of implementing the CPA; however, an added positive factor is that the act of participation in the scoring process expands teacher capacity to implement the CPA. Scorers' surveys indicated that all teachers who participated in the scoring process reported they were better prepared to help their students produce portfolios that would earn ratings at the highest proficiency level. In sum, scorers and administrators felt that scoring was not overly burdensome and increased understanding of their schools' portfolios. However, as will be detailed is the scoring section of this report, significant increases in time devoted to scoring appear necessary to increase reliability.

Did Teachers and Students Value the CPA?

Data pertaining to this question come from teacher and student surveys and interviews with teachers and principals/lead teachers. The following issues were examined:

- teacher commitment to the CPA;
- teacher and student perceptions of the benefits of the CPA and the skills it assesses; and
- teacher and student perceptions of the value of the CPA.

Teacher commitment to the CPA: Teacher commitment, or "buy-in," represents a substantial component for successful implementation and is borne out in interviews with teachers, as well as principals/lead teachers. When asked to offer advice to hypothetical colleagues in other schools about necessary ingredients for successful implementation of the CPA, teacher buy-in was a recurring theme.

Teacher surveys indicated that teachers in both LCR and HCR schools felt there was a strong commitment to the implementation of the CPA. However, in LCR schools, 90 percent agreed or strongly agreed, while in HCR schools, 79 percent agreed or strongly agreed. A possible explanation for the difference between teacher reports is the presence of academy-based programs in the HCR schools. In some of these schools, the high completion rates represented student work in one or two academies; interviews with teachers in these schools indicated that teachers in the other academies did not necessarily have a commitment to the CPA. The instrument asked respondents to comment on commitment in the school in general, not on a subgroup, team, or academy within it.

This explanation is supported by the greater percentage of teachers (21 percent) in HCR schools who disagree that there is a strong commitment to CPA by teachers and administrators in their schools than is the case in LCR schools (10 percent).

Table 8: Percent of teachers who report strong commitment to CPA by teachers and administrators

	LCR (N=39)	HCR (N=14)
Strongly agree	28	43
Agree	62	36
Disagree	10	21
Strongly disagree	0	0

Interviews with teachers suggested that buy-in was related to a cooperative, team approach to implementing the CPA. In one academy-based school, a teacher reported that there was a great deal of buy-in among teachers in one academy "because we work as a team and discuss the issues so we know what we are doing." In another school, a teacher reported that serving on the committee that tailored the portfolio to her particular school was the key to teacher buy-in and commitment.

Teacher and student perceptions of the benefits of the CPA: Teacher commitment to an educational intervention is usually determined by the value teachers assign to it in terms of its benefits to students. During interviews with teachers, respondents were asked to cite the primary purpose of the CPA. The most frequent response was that it benefited students. Teacher and student surveys included questions pertaining to the benefits of the CPA and the skills assessed.

There was general agreement among teacher respondents that the skills upon which the CPA was based represented skills valued by both employers and post-secondary institutions. In HCR schools, a greater percentage of teachers reported benefits of the CPA in terms of improving student work, interest to employers, and interest to post-secondary institutions than did teachers in LCR schools.

Student surveys indicate that a higher percentage of students in the HCR schools believe that the CPA and the skills upon which it is based are beneficial than do students in the LCR schools. See Table 9 for the survey data.

Table 9: Percent of teachers and students identifying benefits of the CPA and skills measured on the CPA

	Teachers		Students	
	LCR (N=41)	HCR (N=16)	LCR (673)	HCR (N=471)
Employers value skills	98	100	78	85
Post-secondary institutions value skills	98	100	78	84
CPA helps students master skills	89	88	54	68
Skills will help students in the future	*	*	73	86
CPA improves students' academic work	77	87	55	63
CPA is of interest to employers	68	94	56	68
CPA is of interest to post-secondary institutions	54	64	58	67
CPA will help students in the future	*	*	58	75
Recommend that other students do the CPA	*	*	59	78

*Item was not included on Teacher Survey.

Teacher and student perceptions of the value of the CPA and the standards assessed by the CPA: Teacher survey data indicate general agreement that the CPA is important for students; however, teachers in HCR schools are much more likely to value the CPA in terms of its importance to teachers than do teachers in LCR schools. Moreover, in LCR schools, teachers report that only 41 percent of their students are motivated and interested in the CPA; 86 percent of HCR teachers report that students are motivated and interested.

Table 10: Percent of teachers who value the CPA

	LCR (N=41)	HCR (N=16)
CPA is a valuable assessment for teachers	68	94
Students are motivated and interested in CPA	41	86
CPA is important for students	87	88
Scoring the CPA increased my knowledge of student mastery	N/A	98

Student survey data in Table 11 indicate that 91 percent of students in HCR schools believed their teachers felt the CPA was important compared to 69 percent of students in LCR schools. Also, more than 80 percent of students in schools at both completion rate levels report that their teachers value the standards; yet more students in the HCR schools believe the CPA represents a good way to teach, learn, and assess the standards than do students in the LCR schools.

Table 11: Percent of students who value the CPA and the standards assessed by the CPA

	LCR (N=673)	HCR (N=471)
My teachers think it is important for me to learn the skills	82	93
I understood the skills	80	91
My teacher spent enough time explaining the skills	79	77
I know when I have mastered the skills	63	78
My teachers think the CPA is important	69	91
CPA is a good teaching and learning tool	59	75
CPA is a good way to measure skills	66	81
I understood how to do the entries that make up the CPA	73	80

Interviews with teachers and principals/lead teachers elicited comments about the CPA's impact on students. In addition to the feeling that the CPA would help with access to jobs and college, teachers and principals/lead teachers believed there was an intrinsic benefit to students. They pointed to the pride students took in completing their entries, the sense of achievement they gained as they demonstrated mastery of the skills, and the personal growth that occurred as a result of the reflective component of the CPA. Some respondents also commented on the stress that the portfolio imposed on students, but it was felt that this would be alleviated in the future by beginning implementation earlier in the school year.

Teacher commitment, or buy-in, seems to be present in large measure based on the value placed on the CPA. Because the data provide a sample of teachers and students in HCR and LCR schools, it is possible to compare the degree to which the CPA is valued in both settings. It appears that the importance of the standards or skills are valued highly in both settings; however, in LCR schools, the CPA is not valued as highly as in the HCR schools. This again suggests that in those schools where a greater percentage of teachers value the CPA, teacher buy-in is greater. The teamwork and collaboration required for successful implementation of the CPA also requires that a substantial number of teachers believe that the CPA is important.

How Can the Implementation of the CPA Be Improved?

Teachers' surveys explored the question by asking teachers to identify what they saw as the five most important factors or resources that **would** have made the CPA more successful. In other words, we wanted teachers to identify the resources they did not have (or have enough of) but thought would have been useful.

The top five factors for **LCR** schools were:

1. More teacher experience with the CPA (50 percent)
2. Students with more experience with portfolios (43 percent)
3. More school-wide support of the CPA (43 percent)
4. More class time for the CPA (38 percent)
5. More professional development related to the CPA (31 percent)

The top six factors for **HCR** schools were:

1. More teacher experience with the CPA (59 percent)
2. Students with more experience with portfolios (53 percent)
3. More school-wide support of the CPA (29 percent)
4. More school-wide support of the standards (29 percent)
5. More experience with the standards (29 percent)
6. Integrated curriculum (29 percent)

The top five factors that overlapped were: more teacher experience with the CPA, students with more experience with portfolios, and more school-wide support of the CPA. LCR schools appear to have more consensus about their desired factors than did HCR schools; four of the five top LCR factors came in at over 35 percent. Two of the top HCR factors came in at over 35 percent.

The largest differences between LCR and HCR schools occurred in the following factors:

	LCR	HCR
More professional development	31	6
Different professional development	19	0
More school-wide support of the CPA	43	29
Integrated curriculum	17	29

The substantial disparities between LCR and HCR teachers regarding professional development and school-wide support may be quite telling. Background about professional development is important. All professional development was delivered at each school site by WestEd staff who followed a standardized format and distributed the same materials to all participants. Furthermore, schools received the same amount of professional development. What varied were the number of attendees at the sessions and the conditions under which teachers attended (paid/unpaid, mandatory/optional). Regardless of what varied, LCR teachers felt less prepared to implement the CPA. They also felt much less supported by their schools.

Interviews with principals/lead teachers in LCR schools indicated a general level of frustration about the inability of their school to implement the CPA at a high level by the end of the school year. They suggested possible remedies that reached beyond the classroom to include more support, including a need for more or different preparation for implementing the CPA.

Table 12: Percent of teachers selecting factors they did not have which would have made the CPA more successful in the classroom

	LCR (N=43)	HCR (N=19)
Integrated curriculum	17	29
Previous experience with standards-based assessment	10	6
Previous experience with performance-based assessment	12	6
Block scheduling	12	0
Significant numbers of students in common with other teachers using the CPA	19	12
Team teaching	19	18
Career academies	12	12
More professional development related to the CPA	31	6
Different professional development related to the CPA than received	19	0
More class time for the CPA	38	24
More experience with the standards	29	29
More experience with the CPA	50	59
Different CPA student guidelines	10	12
Students with more experience with portfolios	43	53
More parent understanding of portfolios	24	18
More school-wide support of the standards	19	29
More school-wide support of the CPA	43	29

Student surveys solicited opinions on how to improve the implementation of the CPA. In the LCR schools, "more examples" received the highest number of student responses (40 percent); in the HCR schools, the highest number of student responses (52 percent) was "more class time."

Table 13: Student opinions on improving CPA implementation

	LCR (N=673)	HCR (N=471)
Make no change	26	21
Devote more time to explaining how to do the CPA	31	46
Allow more class time for students to work on the CPA	38	52
Provide more examples to guide the students' work	40	47

In the LCR schools, 66 percent of the students felt they received all the help needed, while in the HCR schools, 77 percent of the students reported they received all the help they needed. Moreover, in the HCR schools, 22 percent of respondents strongly agreed that they received all the help they needed, while in LCR schools, 15 percent of the respondents strongly agreed that they received the help they needed. It is evident that in both LCR and HCR schools, a sizable number of students reported they did not get all the information, help, and support they needed: 35 percent in the LCR schools and 23 percent in the HCR schools.

Table 14: Percent of student responses on receiving all the information, help, and support needed for success with the CPA

	LCR (N=39)	HCR (N=14)
Strongly agree	15	22
Agree	51	55
Disagree	26	20
Strongly disagree	9	3

Interviews with teachers solicited their opinions about improving implementation of the CPA. The issues identified fell into the following categories:

- more/better leadership on the following issues: including organization, planning, guidelines development
- the importance of beginning implementation early in the school year
- portfolio mechanics
- training (more of it and earlier in the school year)

In one school where computerization of the CPA was a strong component of the program, some of the teachers felt the resolution of certain technical issues would improve implementation. Interviews with principals/lead teachers resulted in comments about:

- training (more of it for more people earlier in the year)
- materials (need for teacher guidelines, electronic templates, work samples on classroom and lab computers)
- leadership issues (importance of teacher leader, more supervision, oversight, follow-through)

In addition to soliciting comments about improving implementation, interviews with teachers and principals/lead teachers asked about barriers to implementation. Among teachers and principals/lead teachers, time constraints and competition with other projects was the most cited barrier.

Teachers also cited student resistance, leadership issues, delays in beginning implementation, and logistics and scheduling. The other issues cited by principals/lead teachers focused on curriculum issues pertaining to balancing technology applications with needs for reflection, leadership, technical issues pertaining to posting portfolios on a web server, student resistance, and lack of training.

In summary, school structure and teacher commitment (buy-in) appear to be key conditions for implementation. Buy-in appears to be related to the degree to which teachers value the CPA.

The data indicate that more experience will help improve implementation in both LCR and HCR schools. Teachers wanted more experience with the standards and the CPA—both for themselves and for students—and more professional development. Students wanted more class time and more examples. However, in LCR schools, structural barriers may hinder teacher buy-in and may not permit teachers to get more experience or continued implementation.

The resolution of leadership issues such as organization, planning, and guidelines development were seen as a way to improve implementation. Notably absent, however, were indications that changes should be made to the school structure. In HCR schools, the structure focused on a whole-school effort and provided support that encouraged implementation. In LCR schools that were more traditional, departmental, and teacher-centered, the structure was not able to support an effort that required an interdisciplinary approach to instruction and assessment. It may be unrealistic to expect that teachers in traditional schools would suggest altering the school structure to assist in the implementation of a program that in their view is a classroom practice.

Did Teachers Receive Appropriate Support to Develop and Implement a CPA Tailored to Their Schools' Needs and Standards?

Data pertaining to the question come from teacher surveys, teacher interviews, principal/lead teacher interviews, and WestEd progress reports. Data from WestEd progress reports describe tailoring activities conducted from July through November of 1998.

Teacher surveys asked several questions to elicit responses pertaining to the quality of the professional development sessions. In the HCR schools, teacher ratings were consistently higher in terms of understanding a number of aspects pertaining to the tailoring and implementation of the CPA. In Table 15, note the striking difference between teachers in LCR and HCR schools in the distribution of "strongly agree" and "agree" responses. In each item, HCR teachers had higher "strongly agree" ratings. Overall, more than 90 percent of the HCR teachers reported that the workshops prepared them adequately to implement the CPA in their classrooms. Nearly one-fourth of LCR teachers reported they were not well prepared to implement the CPA, citing difficulties in the following areas: using the portfolio rubric, designing assignments which help students demonstrate the standards, and integrating the portfolio into curriculum plans.

Table 15: Percent of teachers who reported understanding specific aspects of the tailored CPA after attending CPA professional development workshops

	LCR (N=39)		HCR (N=15)	
	SA	A	SA	A
After the professional development workshops, I understood:				
The purposes of the portfolio	27	63	67	33
The standards	37	51	60	40
The entries in the portfolio	21	67	47	53
The nature of tasks that elicit work demonstrating the standards	18	69	40	60
How to judge when work demonstrates the standards	20	70	33	60
How to use the portfolio rubric	22	57	47	47
How to design assignments which help students demonstrate the standards	19	54	40	53
How to integrate the portfolio into my curriculum plans	16	58	33	60
Overall, the workshops prepared me adequately to implement the portfolio in my classes	22	57	27	67

The teacher survey asked respondents to rate the professional development activities in terms of the amount of time spent and the quality of the training. These data are in Table 16. More than 50 percent of respondents in the LCR schools felt they would have been better prepared had more time been devoted to professional development from WestEd. One third of the HCR teachers reported they would have liked more time for professional development.

Interviews with teachers and principals/lead teachers indicated that time allocations for professional development are always far less than the perceived need. It is a struggle that goes on in every school district, trying to balance need with available time, weighing the value of summer, Saturday, and evening sessions. The high levels of satisfaction reported by HCR and LCR teachers should be considered within the context that "not enough time" is the usual order of business.

In terms of quality, 64 percent of teachers in LCR schools and 73 percent in HCR schools appeared to be completely satisfied with the quality of professional development provided by WestEd.

Table 16: Teacher ratings about the adequacy of time and quality of professional development

	LCR (N=39)				HCR (N=15)			
	SA	A	D	SD	SA	A	D	SD
I could have been better prepared to implement the tailored CPA if:								
More time had been devoted to professional development by WestEd	5	54	21	21	7	27	60	7
The professional development from WestEd had been of higher quality	8	28	42	22	0	27	60	13

Teachers were asked during interviews about ways to improve the professional development provided by WestEd. Half of the respondents cited issues that can be grouped under a category called "leadership." This includes communicating expectations to teachers and students, communicating rewards and consequences, conducting more follow-up. Many respondents emphasized the importance of providing training early in the school year, even during the summer preceding portfolio implementation. Half of the teachers interviewed had no suggestions for improving the professional development; one respondent summed it up by saying, "Leave it the way it is. WestEd did a great job."

The teacher surveys provide strong evidence that the school leadership or teacher leadership did support the professional development sessions by clearly communicating the purpose of the tailored CPA, particularly in HCR schools. In LCR schools, only 14 percent of respondents reported the leadership did not communicate the purpose of the CPA adequately. Again, note the striking difference between teachers in LCR and HCR schools in the distribution of "strongly agree" and "agree" responses.

Table 17: Percent of teachers who strongly agreed or agreed that school administration or teacher leadership communicated the purpose of the CPA clearly

LCR (N=40)		HCR (N=15)	
SA	A	SA	A
23	63	60	40

III. Student Performance and Assessment

This section of the report seeks to answer the questions (1) How reliable were the tailored portfolio as assessments?, (2) What is the relationship between dimensional and overall scores?, and (3) How well did students perform?

The primary data sources are the results of the scoring of 287 portfolios at four schools in the spring of 1999 and questionnaires from scorers. While the portfolio results can help answer the three questions, the conditions under which scoring occurred make it possible to give answers with important caveats. As will be detailed in the following pages, portfolios were scored under circumstances that reflect the reality that schools had difficulty in recruiting and training qualified scorers for the time necessary to score with high reliability. Therefore, it is unreasonable to expect highly reliable scores from the schools examined in this report. That said, the first question (about reliability) demands an answer so that schools can make judgements about the appropriateness of the assessment for high-stakes use and the conditions necessary to obtain reliable results. The second question relates to the first and drives at reliability from the dimensional perspective. If we are able to identify dimensions which are particularly difficult to measure reliably, it might be appropriate to alter or remove the dimension from the model scoring rubric. Also, practitioners might use this information in tailoring their rubrics. The third question is essential because practitioners need to know under what circumstances students can perform adequately and what distribution of scores they might expect. For example, some schools might conclude that the percentage of Advanced portfolios is generally too low, and therefore that they need to alter their curriculum to elicit more Advanced scores. Others might want to reexamine their definition of Advanced.

Prior to presenting scoring data it is appropriate to describe the scoring process that yielded the data. Each school scored its own portfolios following limited training by WestEd staff.

The Scoring Process

Scorers: At every site scorers included educators who had been involved in the portfolio process, but each school had additional scorers. The categories from which additional scorers were selected included educators from the school who were not involved in the portfolio process, school or district administrators, employers, parents, and school board members. Table 18 shows the proportions of scorers by type across the four schools. No distinction was made on the questionnaire to distinguish teachers involved with the portfolio from those who were not. As Table 18 below shows, teachers were the large plurality of scorers (44 percent) and a majority were educators (teachers or administrators, percent). The remaining types of scorers were relatively evenly distributed across four other types.

Table 18: Scorers by type

Category of scorer	Drake	New Technology	Peoria	San Leandro
Teacher	5 (36%)	2 (10%)	21 (84%)	3 (27%)
School or district administrator		1 (5%)	4 (6%)	4 (36%)
Employers		7 (33%)		
Parents	8 (57%)	1 (5%)		
Community leaders	1 (7%)	3 (14%)		2 (18%)
Other		7 (33%)		2 (18%)
Totals	14	21	25	11

Anchor pulling: Prior to the scoring session, WestEd staff facilitated an anchor-pulling session with a small group of teachers (between one and five) involved in the portfolio process. At the session, WestEd facilitated the selection of anchor portfolios to exemplify the different performance levels on the scoring rubrics and some example portfolios to be used in training scorers. Please see Appendix B for the CPA rubric, from which schools tailored their own rubrics.

At each school, nine portfolios were selected (an anchor and two training portfolios for each of the three performance levels on the scoring guide — Basic, Proficient, Advanced). In an ideal anchor-pulling session there would be ample portfolios to select from and a full range of performances amongst portfolios. In the four anchor-pulling sessions there were between 64 and 91 portfolios from which to select the anchors and training portfolios, a restricted pool in every case. This means that it was harder to find portfolios that are clear cut examples of each performance level. Without clear examples it is hard for scorers in training to see the distinct differences between performance levels.

During the anchor pulling, scorers developed rationales explaining why a particular portfolio exemplified a particular performance level. Scorers presented these rationales during training at the actual scoring session. If in the process of anchor-pulling there was good reason to change the scoring rubric prior to the scoring session, that was done. This occurred rarely and changes were minimal.

Training of scorers: In an ideal scoring session, scorers would have a lengthy training followed by a series of pre-scored "calibration" portfolios that they would have to score accurately before being allowed to proceed to independent scoring. Then scorers would periodically stop scoring and recalibrate to ensure that their interpretation of the rubric had not "drifted." This two-step process ensures that only scorers who are interpreting the rubric in a consistent way are allowed to score and improves scoring reliability. The reality for the tailored CPA scoring sessions was different. First, the total length of time that schools arranged for scoring was only one day, often ending in mid-afternoon because teachers' working days normally end then. Also, schools who had community members, such as a parents or business leaders, score felt that they were impinging on scorers' time if they kept scorers for a long day. Therefore, lengthy and appropriate training was not possible. In addition to limited training time, it was also not feasible to calibrate scorers. The reason for this is that, under such schemes, there will almost certainly be scorers who do not calibrate and are not allowed to participate in scoring. So, a teacher who had been a key person in leading students to develop portfolios might not calibrate. Or, some of those community members who volunteered their time might not calibrate. Expelling scorers who did not calibrate would often be politically unacceptable in a school setting and would cause ill feeling that could undermine the whole portfolio process.

The scoring sessions began with a brief introduction to the portfolio and the scoring process. Next, scorers were introduced to the scoring rubric and were given an opportunity to read it and ask questions. Then, the anchor portfolios were introduced by having scorers read the Advanced portfolio first, and then a teacher from the anchor-pulling team gave an explanation of how the scoring guide indicates the score that the portfolio received. They gave specific examples of student work in the portfolio that matched to the rubric and answered any questions that scorers raised. This process was repeated for the Proficient and Basic score points.

Once scorers were familiar with the scoring rubric and the anchors, they were given a set of three practice portfolios. Each scorer independently assigned a score to each portfolio using the scoring rubric and anchors to guide their decisions. Then a teacher from the anchor-pulling team revealed the score that had been assigned by the anchor-pulling team. They then led the group in a discussion about why the portfolio was assigned that score. This process was repeated for the other two portfolios. In most cases training took two hours.

In sum, these conditions naturally led to lower-than-desired reliability. (Schools implementing tailored portfolios in the 1999-2000 school year scored under better conditions than in 1998-1999 and generally achieved higher reliability.)

Scoring: At Drake, Peoria and San Leandro, portfolios received two scores each, and in some cases a third scorer was used to resolve discrepancies between the first two scores. The scoring process at New Technology was necessarily different, since all portfolios were electronic and viewable online only. Thirty-two percent of the portfolios only received a single score at that site because it was harder to track the online scoring process. Of the remaining portfolios, 25 percent received two scores and 43 percent received three scores.

Performance levels: Each school used three levels of performance to give scores on the dimensions of the rubric and an overall score. Table 19 shows the levels of performance. Although they have different labels, conceptually these levels were regarded as the same as shown by the common interpretation that was in parentheses on all the scoring guides except that of New Technology.

Table 19: Name of performance levels, by school

	Performance Levels 1	2	3
	(Not ready to show to college or employer)	(Ready to show to college or employer)	(Superior quality, may exceed expectations of college or employer)
Drake	Emerging	Competent	Outstanding
New Tech	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Peoria	Developing	Proficient	Advanced
San Leandro	Basic	Proficient	Advanced

Rubric dimensions: Because the portfolio guidelines and scoring rubrics had been tailored to the assessment priorities of each school, there was some variation in the dimensions of student performance being assessed. Appendix C contains the scoring rubrics used by the scorers at each school.

Table 20 shows the dimensions for each school. The number of dimensions ranged from four (as in the original CPA portfolio) to seven. The explanation for this was that the schools with seven dimensions deliberately had one dimension for each standard they were assessing, whereas those schools with four dimensions collapsed some of their standards into one dimension.

Table 20: Scoring dimensions assessed, by school

	Dimensions 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Drake	Professional Preparation	Work Planning	Technology Skills	Communication			
New Tech	Technology Literacy	Citizenship & Ethics	Critical Thinking	Career Preparation	Collaboration	Written Communication	Oral Communication
Peoria	Personal	Inter-personal	Thinking & Problem-solving	Communication	Employment Literacy	Technology Literacy	Making Connections
San Leandro	Career Preparation	Analysis	Technology	Communication			

Across schools there were four dimensions that WestEd staff judged to be equivalent, although their titles varied. Table 21 shows these common dimensions. Inter-rater reliability analyses treated these as common dimensions.

Table 21: Common dimensions assessed across schools

	Common Dimensions			
	Drake	**New Tech**	**Peoria**	**San Leandro**
Career Preparation	1	4	5	1
Thinking and Problem-Solving	2	3	3	2
Technology	3	1	6	3
Communication	4	6	4	4

Assigned scores: Scorers were instructed to assign a score to every dimension and also to assign an overall score that reflected their judgment about the portfolio in its entirety (holistically). Scores were assigned by checking a box on the appropriate cell of the grid that corresponded to the level of performance for that dimension or overall performance. Scorers could also add a plus or a minus to any score, although they were not required to do so. This allowed a scorer who was trying to decide between two performance levels a way to assign a score but still reflect that it might, for example, be just barely in the Proficient level, or almost in the Advanced level. Scores reported to students, however, showed only the main level they were judged to be in for the overall score. So, a student was told only that they were in either the Basic/emerging/developing, Proficient/competent or Advanced/outstanding level.

How reliable were the tailored portfolio as assessments?

Inter-rater reliability is a measure of how often the first independent score assigned to a portfolio agreed with the second independent rating given by another scorer to the same portfolio. Two types of reliability analyses, inter-rater reliability, and Cronbach's alpha were performed. To see the relationships between the dimensions of the scoring rubrics within schools and across schools on the common dimensions, bivariate correlations and multiple regression analyses were performed.

In our analyses, inter-rater reliability was calculated in two ways: first, in terms of exact agreement within a scoring level and, second, allowing agreement across main performance levels by use of the plus and minus scores. Under the first method, scores were counted as agreeing if they were in the same performance level. For example, scores of Proficient minus and Proficient plus would count as agreement, but Basic plus and Proficient minus would not, even though Basic plus and Proficient minus are "closer" together than Proficient minus and Proficient plus.

Under the second method, scores with exact agreements and scores of plus on one level and minus on the level above were regarded as agreeing. For example, Basic plus and Proficient minus were counted as agreeing, but Basic plus and Proficient were not. Table 22 shows the inter-rater reliabilities for the overall portfolio (versus dimensional) scores under each method, and the range of inter-rater reliabilities calculated for individual scorers. The reason for using two methods was to see if the use of plus and minus scores improved the agreement of scorers when scorers were divided across performance levels, but close (e.g., Basic plus and Proficient minus).

Table 22: Inter-rater reliability of overall scores

	Inter-rater Reliability (method one, agreement within a level)		Inter-rater Reliability (method two, agreement within a plus or minus)	
School	Overall %	Min/Max IRR per scorer %	Overall %	Min/Max IRR per scorer %
Drake	57.89	33.3 / 83.3	66.67	33.3 / 83.3
New Technology	68.38	38.9 / 84.2	73.5	39.5 / 85.8
Peoria	69.51	25.0 / 100.0	75.61	25.0 / 100.0
San Leandro	51.47	30.8 / 100.0	52.94	30.8 / 100.0

Inter-rater reliabilities were not as high as desirable but were understandable given the difficult scoring conditions. Using method two where score agreements are allowed across the level boundaries produced slightly higher reliabilities.

Using method one inter-rater reliabilities ranged from 57.89 percent to 69.51 percent. Using method two they ranged from 52.94 percent to 75.61 percent. New Technology and Peoria both achieved inter-rater reliability over 73 percent using method two. It is not clear why New Technology and Peoria achieved higher levels of reliability.

Reliabilities for individual scorers varied greatly, as opposed to for scorers at a given school taken as a group. Individual inter-rater reliability ranged between 25 percent (the first scorer agreeing with the second scorer 25 percent of the time) and 100 percent. There seems to be no connection between the wide range of scorer reliability and the overall reliability. This indicates that there were unreliable scorers in the sites with higher overall reliability and reliable scorers at the sites where overall reliability was low. Furthermore, there was not a clear correlation between having a large proportion of teachers as scorers, who might be expected to have a greater shared understanding of the rubric than employers, parents, or community members, and higher reliability.

Inter-rater reliability was also calculated for individual dimensions of the scoring guide. These are shown below in Table 23. On the whole the reliabilities by dimension were similar to the reliabilities of the overall scores. There were some exceptions. In the case of Peoria the Professional Preparation had reliability 18.26 percentage points less than that for the overall scores. Similarly, the reliability in Thinking and Problem-Solving dimension at New Technology was 10.86 percentage points lower than that for the overall score. At San Leandro the Communication reliability was 8.19 percentage points lower. There appeared to be no pattern across sites about which dimension had lower reliabilities.

Table 23: Inter-rater reliabilities by dimension

Method one

Common Dimensions	Professional Preparation	Thinking and Problem-Solving	Technology Skills	Communication
Drake	58.93%	51.79%	58.18%	58.49%
New Tech	58.62%	57.52%	69.03%	60.53%
Peoria	51.25%	57.14%	64.63%	57.32%
San Leandro	64.71%	55.88%	47.06%	43.28%
Combined	58.13%	55.41%	61.32%	55.70%

Site Specific Dimensions	Citizenship & Ethics	Collaboration	Oral Communication	Personal	Interpersonal	Making Connections
New Tech	52.83%	58.26%	57.84%	NA	NA	NA
Peoria	NA	NA	NA	53.95%	61.25%	58.97%

Method two

Common Dimensions	Professional Preparation	Thinking and Problem-Solving	Technology Skills	Communication
Drake	60.71%	51.79%	58.18%	58.49%
New Tech	63.79%	58.41%	72.57%	63.16%
Peoria	52.50%	61.04%	65.85%	58.54%
San Leandro	64.71%	55.88%	47.06%	44.78%
Combined	60.63%	57.32%	62.89%	57.28%

Site Specific Dimensions	Citizenship & Ethics	Collaboration	Oral Communication	Personal	Interpersonal	Making Connections
New Tech	55.66%	60.00%	58.82%	NA	NA	NA
Peoria	NA	NA	NA	53.95%	65.00%	61.54%

Test Reliabilities

The reliability of a test is a statistical calculation of how much consistency exists among the measures (items) in the test. Reliability increases as the number of items increases. Ideally, test reliability coefficients are obtained by correlating the results of two measurements using the same test. When a test is only administered once, another way to obtain the reliability coefficient is to split the test results into two halves and then correlate one half of the test with the other half. This is known as the split-half method and produces a measure of internal consistency. A more sophisticated calculation of the reliability coefficient is to use Cronbach's alpha (α) which produces, in effect, the mean of all possible split-half reliability coefficients. The closer the test reliability is to 1, the more consistent it is.

Reliability coefficients were calculated in three ways: using the scores on all dimensions given in the first scoring round, using the scores on all dimensions given in the second scoring round, and using both first and second round overall scores only. The reliabilities are shown in Table 24.

Table 24: Reliability coefficients for each portfolio

School	Reliability Coefficients (Cronbach's α) First scores on all dimensions	Second scores on all dimensions	First and second scores for overall scores only
Drake	.89	.87	.75
New Technology	.88	.89	.77
Peoria	.92	.94	.82
San Leandro	.93	.86	.41

The reliabilities for first and second scores using all dimensions are reasonable considering this was the first year of administration, although the number of scores upon which this is based is relatively low. This shows that the portfolio assessment was consistent in measuring the ability of students across the dimensions. Reliabilities based on only the first and second round overall scores are weaker. This is because they are calculated on only two scores, whereas the dimension scores number between 4 and 7, which helps reliability. This indicates the value of scoring by dimensions and the accuracy that is lost when simply reporting overall scores.

Based only on overall scores, the reliability for Peoria is reasonable, for Drake and New Technology it is lower than ideal, and for San Leandro it is outside of the acceptable range. This may indicate that scorers at San Leandro were making the judgment about overall score in some way different than their judgments about scores on dimensions, as the scores by dimension produce much higher reliabilities than just the overall scores. This, again, points to the need to improve scorer training.

As a whole, reliability data suggest that improving scoring conditions and training is necessary for the portfolio to be used in high-stakes environments. However, it is likely that via increased training time and other steps to be mentioned in the next section of this report, reliability could increase so that high-stakes use of the portfolio is appropriate, as part of a multiple-measure system.

Critically, current levels of reliability may not significantly impact scalability—no 1998-1999 schools indicated that lower than desired reliability would decrease implementation. In fact, HCR schools are generally expanding implementation. *Data from 1999-2000 scoring, where emphasis on training and calibration was stronger than in 1998-1999, sheds more light on the portfolio's capacity for reliable scoring.* In the 1999-2000 effort, where WestEd staff focused on increasing training time and better overall scoring conditions, reliability was higher than in 1998-1999 (a range of 64 percent to 79 percent versus a range of 58 percent to 71 percent). WestEd staff more aggressively communicated the need for reliability to participating schools in 1999-2000. Also, in 1999-2000 WestEd staff targeted training at scoring dimensions where it was low in 1998-1999 (e.g., Technology, Analysis).

Increasing reliability

While no definitive data exist about why reliability was lower than desired, or why it varied across schools, WestEd staff hypothesize that adhering to the scoring procedures listed below would substantially increase reliability. As mentioned previously, these procedures were followed in 1999-2000 and reliability generally increased.

- Longer training (more than the two hours generally used by the 1998-1999 schools) is needed to ensure that scorers apply the scoring rubric more consistently. In particular, scorers who in practice portfolios show low reliability should be targeted for extra training.
- Target training to dimensions of the rubric that had the lowest inter-rater reliabilities.
- Examine the wording of dimensions of the rubric that had the lowest inter-rater reliabilities and rewrite where appropriate.

In high-stakes scoring situations, formal calibration where scorers have to get exact agreement on a certain percentage of the practice portfolios they scored in order for their scores to count, should be considered. Scorers who do not get exact agreement on a certain percentage of the practice portfolios would not be allowed to continue or would have their scores not count. Given the substantial range in reliability at the level of the individual scorer (32 percent to 92 percent on average), calibration could improve reliability considerably. However, if calibration is used, it might result in a teacher who had been involved in portfolio development and implementation not being allowed to score.

What is The Relationship Between Dimensional and Overall Scores?

To investigate the relationship of dimension scores to overall scores, bivariate correlations were calculated. The correlations show the strength of the relationship between the scores students obtained on each dimension and the overall scores they received for the whole portfolio. The closer a correlation is to 1, the stronger the relationship. One would expect the correlation to be high, given that the overall score is a summary of how the student did across all dimensions. If it is low, then there may be little relationship between what the dimension is measuring and what scorers valued in the portfolio overall. Table 25 shows the results of the bivariate correlations.

Table 25: Bivariate correlation of dimensions scores and overall scores

All Sites	
Thinking	0.805
Professional Prep	0.739
Communication	0.782
Technology Skill	0.706
Drake	
Thinking	0.867
Professional Prep	0.847
Communication	0.856
Technology Skill	0.724
New Technology	
Thinking	0.814
Professional Prep	0.779
Communication	0.851
Technology Skill	0.693
Oral	0.818
Citizen	0.673
Collaboration	0.734
Peoria	
Thinking	0.815
Professional Prep	0.665
Communication	0.820
Technology Skill	0.694
Connect	0.879
Personal	0.731
Interpersonal	0.682
San Leandro	
Thinking	0.901
Professional Prep	0.751
Communication	0.875
Technology Skill	0.788

The correlations show that, for the common dimensions across schools (Thinking and Problem-Solving, Professional Preparation, Communication and Technology skills) the relationships of the dimensions to the overall score ranges from .706 for Technology to .805 for Thinking and Problem-Solving, all of which are fairly strong correlations. This means that there is a strong relationship between what was measured in those four dimensions and what was valued by scorers in the overall scores.

At Drake, the correlations of the dimensions with overall scores are strong. At New Technology, there were strong correlations between overall score and Thinking and Problem-Solving, Written Communication, and Oral Communication. There were moderate correlations between overall score and Professional Preparation and Collaboration, with lower correlations for Technology and Citizenship. At Peoria, three of the dimensions (Thinking and Problem-Solving, Making Connections, and Communication) had strong correlations with overall score. Overall score was moderately correlated with Personal Skills, Technology Skills, Interpersonal Skills and, lastly, Professional Preparation. At San Leandro there were strong correlations between overall score and the Thinking and Problem-Solving and Communication dimensions, and moderately strong correlations with the Technology Skills and Professional Preparation dimensions.

The Thinking and Problem-Solving dimension consistently correlated strongly with overall scores. This is not surprising since every school's portfolio contained two work samples that showed evidence of Thinking and Problem-Solving. Next, the Professional Preparation dimension was consistently important as was the Communication dimension. Again, Professional Preparation was being assessed in several portfolio entries (the personal statement, résumé and application forms mainly), and Written Communication was evidenced throughout because the portfolios were predominantly text-based.

Table 26 shows, for each school, a matrix of the correlations between the dimension scores calculated just using one set of scores per school. The table shows that the correlations between dimensions varied between moderate at New Technology HS to fairly strong at San Leandro HS.

These relationships indicate that the dimensions are moderately related to each other and strongly related to the total score. It may be that the dimensions are hard to distinguish because the portfolio is unlike a traditional assessment in the sense that there are no identifiable items. So, instead of the student receiving a separate score for each piece in his/her portfolio, scores are based on a judgment of whether a standard is demonstrated anywhere in the portfolio. This means that the "items" are really conceptual constructs that might be interpreted differently across scorers. Even if all scorers understand the construct, they are simultaneously examining the portfolio entries to assign between four and seven different scores. It may be this that is contributing to the low inter-rater reliabilities. A way to avoid this would be to give separate scores for the different entries in a portfolio, although this seems against the notion of viewing the portfolio as a whole. Alternatively, being more directive about where evidence of different dimensions might be found could alleviate the problem. For example, "Personal Skills" might best be observed in the personal statement, the resume and the letter of recommendation, while the best place to see "Thinking and Problem-solving Skills" might be the work samples.

Table 26: Correlation matrices of dimensions against dimensions

Highest and lowest correlations are show in bold for each school.

Correlation Matrix – Drake HS

	DIM1	DIM2	DIM3	DIM4
DIM1	1.0000			
DIM2	**.7984**	1.0000		
DIM3	**.5976**	.6985	1.0000	
DIM4	.6528	.6768	.5989	1.0000

Correlation Matrix – New Technology HS

	DIM1	DIM2	DIM3	DIM4	DIM5	DIM6	DIM7
DIM1	1.0000						
DIM2	.4345	1.0000					
DIM3	.4692	.4663	1.0000				
DIM4	.5115	**.3260**	.6848	1.0000			
DIM5	.3245	.3589	.4061	.4991	1.0000		
DIM6	.5814	.3888	**.7295**	.6001	.4042	1.0000	
DIM7	.5273	.3608	.5336	.6268	.6730	.5883	1.0000

Correlation Matrix - Peoria

	DIM1	DIM2	DIM3	DIM4	DIM5	DIM6	DIM7
DIM1	1.0000						
DIM2	.7075	1.0000					
DIM3	.6185	.6030	1.0000				
DIM4	.6457	.6677	**.8040**	1.0000			
DIM5	.6499	.6135	.6878	.7238	1.0000		
DIM6	**.5374**	.5590	.7104	.6261	.6896	1.0000	
DIM7	.6713	.6721	.7863	.7966	.6803	.6834	1.0000

Correlation Matrix – San Leandro HS

	DIM1	DIM2	DIM3	DIM4
DIM1	1.0000			
DIM2	.7840	1.0000		
DIM3	**.7312**	.7969	1.0000	
DIM4	.7341	**.8174**	.7646	1.0000

Relationship of Overall Scores to Completion Rate

The overall scores for first and second scores combined were correlated against the number of completed entries by student. Please note that the results reflect a truncated sample—only portfolios with enough entries to be judged "complete" were analyzed. "Incomplete" portfolios were not scored. Table 27 shows the correlations.

Table 27: Correlation of the overall score with number of completed portfolio entries

School	Correlation
Drake	.27
New Technology	.15
Peoria	.22
San Leandro	.35

The correlations are low, showing that there was little relationship between numbers of completed entries and the overall quality of the portfolio. This should not be taken to mean that it does not matter how many of the portfolio entries were completed by a student. Rather, it reflects the fact that, in this first year, not all schools were able to get students to the point of completion in time for scoring. Portfolios that had significant omissions, such as no work samples, were not scored. Work samples play an important role in showing the student's ability across several of the dimensions that correlated highly with overall score. So, scorers were able to make a judgment when some parts of a portfolio were missing, but this does not mean it is a desirable situation. After the first year of implementation, schools might choose not to score a portfolio that was missing entries.

How Well Did Students Perform?

Table 28 shows the distribution of scores across the performance levels. In the simplest assessment of student performance, 68 percent of students who completed portfolios "passed," or received a Proficient or Advanced score, and 32 percent "failed" or received a Basic. In three of the schools (Drake, New Technology and San Leandro) the majority of scores fall within the Proficient category, but at Peoria, most portfolios were judged to be Basic. At Drake, 26.4 percent of the portfolios were scored as Advanced.

When considering the strength of these scores, the reader should know that only "complete" portfolios (versus incomplete or portfolios where not all entries were done) were scored. This is important as quality correlates with completeness—students with the skills and attitudes to complete a portfolio typically submit higher quality entries than those that do not complete portfolios.

The distribution of scores across the four schools was fairly similar, with the exception of Peoria. (Peoria had 58.9 percent Basic as opposed to an average of 23.2 percent for the other three schools.) Excluding Peoria, the range of Basic was 17.4 percent to 30.2 percent; Proficient 51.8 percent to 58.1 percent; and Advanced 11.8 percent to 26.4 percent. No reason for Peoria's lower scores is apparent.

In comparison to the 1996-1997 cohort, the overall percentage of Proficient scores was the same at 50 percent. Advanced was similar (18 percent in 98-99 and 12 percent in 96-97). At the Basic level, percentages were also similar (32 percent in 98-99 and 38 percent in 96-97).

While the number of schools, students, and portfolios participating in 1996-1997 and 1998-1999 is not large, data suggest that schools possessing the factors for successful implementation identified in 1996-1997 and confirmed in 1998-1999 might expect student performance to fall within the ranges seen in 1996-1997 and 1998-1999. Furthermore, schools might use these expected ranges to decide if they would like to go to a four-point scale to alter the percentage at a given performance level. They might also use these ranges, in combination with reliability data, to determine what stakes to associate with performance.

Table 28: Score distributions per school

		Score Assigned		
School		Basic %	Proficient %	Advanced %
Drake	score 1	21.0	47.3	31.7
	score 2	22.8	56.2	21.0
	mean	**21.9**	**51.8**	**26.4**
New Technology	score 1	19.5	62.4	18.2
	score 2	15.3	51.9	32.6
	mean	**17.4**	**57.15**	**25.4**
Peoria	score 1	63.8	29.7	6.6
	score 2	53.9	37.4	8.8
	mean	**58.9**	**33.6**	**7.7**
San Leandro	score 1	32.3	55.9	11.8
	score 2	28.0	60.3	11.8
	mean	**30.2**	**58.1**	**11.8**
Overall		**32.1**	**50.2**	**17.9**

IV. Whole-school change

This section of the report seeks to answer the following questions: (1) What is the impact of the tailored CPA on teachers and school practices? (2) What is the impact of the tailored CPA on teacher understanding of standards-based teaching, assessment, and portfolios? (3) What is the impact of the tailored CPA on whole-school change, particularly in schools with traditional structures? The great majority of the data analyzed in this section comes from interviews and surveys. It is likely that some response bias favorable to the CPA exists in these data—teachers who responded to the survey may be disproportionately inclined toward positive views of the CPA.

What is the Impact of the Tailored CPA on Teacher and School Practices?

Data pertaining to the question come from teacher and student surveys, and interviews with teachers and principals/lead teachers. The following issues were examined: (a) impact on teacher practices and (b) use of scoring data in the classroom and the school.

a. Impact on teacher practices. This issue was examined by several items on the teacher survey that asked teachers to rate the degree to which they altered their classroom practices in response to the standards and the CPA. A related question focused on the degree to which teachers were able to structure their curriculum. In the LCR schools, 77 percent of the respondents reported they were able to structure their curriculum as they chose; in the HCR schools, 88 percent of the teachers reported they were able to do so.

Table 29: Percent of teachers who reported ability to structure curriculum

	LCR (N=40)		HCR (N=16)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
In this school, I am able to structure my curriculum as I choose.	77	23	88	13

More than 70 percent of teachers in both LCR and HCR schools reported they engaged in the following teacher practices: (1) they made substantial use of the standards to structure their curriculum, (2) they made substantial changes in their teaching methods as a result of using the standards, and (3) they made substantial changes in their teaching methods as a result of using the CPA. Table 30 indicates that standards and the CPA had some impact on changes in teacher practices in both LCR and HCR schools. Teachers in HCR schools attributed more changes in their teaching practices to the CPA and students' efforts for the CPA than did teachers in LCR schools.

Table 30: Percent of teachers who altered curriculum and teaching methods

	LCR (N=40)		HCR (N=16)	
	Some change	None	Some change	None
I used the standards to structure my curriculum.	88	12	87	13
Using the standards led me to alter or rethink my teaching methods.	92	8	100	0
Using the CPA as a means of organizing student work led me to alter or rethink my teaching methods	78	22	94	6
Seeing student efforts for the CPA led me to alter or rethink my teaching methods.	71	29	87	13

The student survey elicited comparative responses about teacher practices. When asked if teachers who use the CPA teach differently than non-CPA teachers, 46 percent of LCR students agreed or strongly agreed. At HCR schools, 68 percent agreed or strongly agreed and the percent of students that strongly agreed was triple that of the LCR schools. When asked if CPA teachers gave different assignments than non-CPA teachers, 52 percent of LCR students agreed/strongly agreed and 64 percent of HCR students agreed/strongly agreed. This corroborates teacher reports that the CPA influenced teaching practices, particularly related to use of standards.

Table 31: Percent of students who perceive differences in teacher practices

	LCR (N=626)		HCR (N=436)	
	SA	A	SA	A
Teachers who use the CPA teach differently than teachers who do not use the CPA	8	38	24	44
Teachers who use the CPA ask me to do different kinds of assignments than teachers who do not use the CPA.	10	42	14	50

During interviews teachers were asked whether the CPA had an impact on their teaching. Positive comments fell into four categories: student achievement and growth, teacher personal growth, CPA as a vehicle for standards-based instruction, and CPA as an assessment tool. Among the comments were the following:

(1) student achievement and growth:

- It was good for us to see that it does work, that students do catch on and take pride in what they do.
- Students were proud of what they had done.
- Students developed greater organizational skills.
- The CPA gave students a broader view of their education.
- The CPA greatly impacted their career understanding and enhanced their use of technology.

(2) teacher personal growth:

- It allows us to organize. It will turn out to be a good integrating document.
- It enabled us to do new and innovative things.
- At first, it was more things to do, but I had never done a reflective piece where kids thought about what they did. That affected how I taught.
- For some teachers it was a wonderful project, which gave us a chance to show all that can be achieved, tremendously interdisciplinary.

(3) CPA as a vehicle for standards-based instruction:

- When assigning work, we now look at standards and, therefore, we know why we are assigning a particular piece of work.

(4) CPA as an assessment tool:

- It helped me evaluate what I was doing in the classroom.
- One can measure student achievement of standards without looking at the minutiae.
- It provided a way for students to do self-evaluation.

Some teachers felt the impact was minimal because they were already familiar with standards-based instruction and assessment.

- Our teachers already understood standards, portfolio assessment; we were already doing integration, authentic assessment, project-based learning.

Some of the negative comments focused on additional time and effort needed to integrate the CPA into existing curriculum. Other comments included the following:

- It was difficult to make it an integral part of the curriculum. It became a distraction to the curriculum.
- It was an intrusion on the curriculum.

Interviews with principals and lead teachers produced results that were consistent with teacher interviews. Their comments included the following:

- Teachers experienced growth.
- Not all teachers bought in – yet. We have work to do.
- The impact came from the work summaries and the work samples required of every student. Our students needed a lot of one-on-one. The CPA put more work on teachers, but they put students' interests first.
- For teachers who bought in, it was a positive effect; for the ones who did not, it was a negative effect.
- The process of coming to consensus as a staff on the outcomes was a positive experience. Teachers in different subject areas felt connected through the portfolio.
- Teachers saw that students did much better work than they had expected – incredible work.
- It made teachers see the relationship between standards and classroom performance.

b. Use of scoring data in the classroom and the school. The teacher survey asked respondents to indicate whether they would like to receive CPA scoring data on individual students. In LCR schools, 75 percent of the respondents indicated they would like to receive the data; in HCR schools, 94 percent of respondents indicated they would like to receive the data. This seems to indicate more of a commitment in HCR schools to use the portfolio as an integral part of classroom work and grading structure than in LCR schools.

The teacher survey also asked respondents to indicate the ways in which student performance on the CPA was incorporated into student grades or other relatively high stakes outcomes. More than 60 percent of teachers in LCR and HCR schools reported incorporating student performance on the CPA into the semester grade in their classes. More than 30 percent of teachers in LCR and HCR schools reported that student performance on the CPA was a requirement of either graduation or academy certification. In interviews with teachers, some respondents added to the survey options by indicating they reported CPA results to their students. Interviews with principals/lead teachers indicated that in some schools, scoring data were reported to students and student advisors. It also was used in some schools for program evaluation and course placement.

Table 32: Percent of teachers selecting options for incorporating student performance on the CPA

	LCR (N=42)	HCR (N=17)
A percentage of the semester grade in my class(es)	62	65
A percentage of the semester grade in other class(es)	14	24
Graduation requirement	26	18
Academy certification	5	12
None of the above	7	6
Other/don't know	31	6

In summary, the CPA had impact on the great majority of teachers that used it and that impact was identified by teachers and students. The extent of that impact is not known. Additionally, HCR schools almost always reported greater impact on teaching practice than LCR schools. This is consistent with the belief that HCR schools embraced the CPA more deeply than LCR schools.

What is the Impact of the CPA on Teacher Understanding of Standards-Based Teaching, Assessment, and Portfolios?

Data pertaining to the question come from interviews with teachers and principals/lead teachers. Nine of the 16 teachers interviewed reported the CPA had no impact on their understanding of standards-based teaching, assessment, and portfolios because they came into the program with a high level of understanding in each of the areas. The remaining seven teachers reported they had experienced personal growth and understanding and specifically mentioned a deeper understanding of assessment and the relationship between standards and performance. All of the principals/lead teachers interviewed felt the teachers in their schools had a greater understanding of standards-based teaching, assessment, or portfolios. Comments from these interviews included the following:

- The CPA made teachers see the relationship between standards and classroom performance.
- For some teachers it was the first experience with a portfolio. Tying the standards to the portfolio was very helpful.
- It was a key to teachers' growth and understanding.
- It certainly helped for better understanding of assessment and portfolio. We worked with standards before the project, but it improved understanding on all three.

What is the Impact of the CPA on Whole-school change, Particularly in Schools with Traditional Structures?

Data come from teacher surveys and interviews with teachers and principals/lead teachers. The following issues were examined: (a) portfolios as a valuable support for implementing standards-based curriculum and assessment school-wide, (b) changes in the school/program structure, procedures, or curriculum, (c) the school's plans for next year, (d) overall impact, and (e) the relationship of existing school structure to whole-school change.

a. Portfolios as a valuable support for implementing standards-based curriculum and assessment school-wide. Teacher surveys indicate there is general agreement in LCR and HCR schools that the CPA is valuable for implementing standards-based curriculum and assessment school-wide. Teachers in HCR schools, however, appear to feel much more strongly about the CPA as a valuable support for implementing standards-based curriculum and assessment school-wide (HCR 47 percent strongly agree, LCR 15 percent strongly agree).

Table 33: Percent of teachers who strongly agree or agree on the value of the CPA for implementing standards-based curriculum and assessment school-wide.

	LCR (N=39)	HCR (N=15)
Strongly Agree	15	47
Agree	77	47

b. Changes in the school/program structure, procedures, or curriculum. Teacher surveys indicate that in the LCR schools, 32 percent of teachers report substantial change in their schools as a result of the CPA compared to six percent of teachers in HCR schools. The enabling structures discussed earlier in these findings provides an explanation of why HCR teachers report fewer changes. The enabling structures, already established in HCR schools, provide many of the key conditions required for successful implementation of the CPA. LCR schools, in contrast, had to make alterations in their structures, procedures, and/or curriculum to accommodate the CPA's implementation. More than 85 percent of teachers in both LCR and HCR schools report that some change took place. Additionally, WestEd staff indicated they believe that many lead teachers and principals at LCR schools learned about their schools' weaknesses relative to efforts that require whole-school change and implementation of innovations. WestEd staff also indicated that many teachers at LCR schools saw the portfolio as an add-on activity and that supportive LCR teachers thought they could implement the portfolio in their classrooms but that teacher support and school structures prevented comprehensive implementation across their schools.

Table 34: Percent of teachers who report changes in school/program structure, procedures, or curriculum based on CPA related student work

	LCR (N=39)	HCR (N=15)
Substantially	32	6
Slightly	54	81
Not at all	14	13

c. The school's plans for next year. Teacher surveys asked respondents whether they intended to continue using the CPA next year. In LCR schools, 98 percent of the teachers indicated they planned to continue using the CPA next year; in HCR schools, 100 percent of the teachers indicated they planned to continue.

Interviews with principals/lead teachers indicated that 100 percent of the interviewees planned to continue, and to expand the CPA. Expansions included: add more students from the same grade in which the program was implemented this year, extend the program to other grade levels, extend the program to other academies in the school, and include more teachers in the program. One principal indicated a new course would be added to orient students to the CPA and another planned to include the CPA in an already existing orientation course for incoming students.

Actual implementation data about LCR schools in the 1999-2000 school year appears to contradict the survey and interview data from LCR schools. No LCR schools implemented the portfolio on a school-wide basis in 1999-2000, nor did they implement the CPA at levels equal to 1998-1999. Why LCR teachers and administrators reported that they would implement in 1999-2000 and did not do so is unclear.

d. Overall impact. When asked directly to indicate whether the CPA had an impact on whole-school change, interviewed teachers indicated that their schools had become more standards-based, that the CPA was an important assessment tool, and that the CPA helped their schools in the state accreditation process. They pointed to plans to expand the program and to improve it. Interviews with principals/lead teachers indicated that whole-school change had not yet occurred in three schools, but anticipated that it would. In the five schools where principals/lead teachers reported whole-school change, interviewees pointed to plans for higher stakes, more teacher discussions with colleagues, better communication with incoming students, and student awareness of standards.

One teacher summed up the impact of the CPA on her school as follows:

> It standardized a lot of what we do here so that classes were doing the same thing [focusing on the learning outcomes] and assessment of the learning outcomes applicable to our content areas. It was important that we all used a standard assessment. It brought the school together more.

e. The relationship of existing school structure to whole-school change. Assessing the CPA's impact on whole-school change has to be considered in the context of the schools' existing structures and the implementation goals and strategies employed in the schools. These varied across the eight participating schools and included three options: (1) whole school, (2) academy or team, and (3) all students in a grade level (without a shared cohort of students).

Three schools in the sample implemented the CPA on a whole-school basis. All of these schools had a small student body. One of the schools was newly created with a small staff recruited specifically because of their experience and expertise in carrying out the mission of the school. Some of the teachers in this school reported they had previous experience with portfolios, standards-based teaching and assessments, and integrated curriculum. The CPA proved to be an excellent vehicle for carrying out the school's mission, and the entire staff worked on the tailoring process. This school produced a substantial number of completed portfolios. However, very little whole-school change could be reported here, since they began with much of the structures associated with whole-school change already in place.

The other two schools, both LCR, that implemented on a whole-school basis, were two of four high schools in a district, all of which had been committed to the CPA at the district level. Interview and survey data indicated enthusiasm for the CPA. However, two-thirds of the respondents from the two schools reported they needed more experience with the standards and almost half needed more experience with the CPA. Almost 90 percent of teachers across the two schools reported the school had changed its structure, procedures, or curriculum based on student work related to the CPA portfolio. An interview with the principal (one person is the principal of both schools), indicated that teachers were trying very hard to do the additional work imposed by the implementation of the CPA. These two schools did not produce a substantial number of completed portfolios, but the principal felt they would do so in the second year of the program. However, these two schools did not commit the resources needed to bring about whole-school change sufficient to implement the CPA in 1999-2000.

In three of the four schools where the CPA was implemented on a team basis, many of the key preconditions were already in place at the beginning of the program: integrated curriculum, team teaching, and a shared group of students. Teachers in these three HCR schools reported only slight changes in teacher practices.

Implementing the CPA by involving all students in a grade level without shared groups of students appears to be the most difficult of the three options. Two of the schools in the sample attempted to do so. The principals of both schools reported mixed success. Generally, for teachers who bought in to the CPA, there was a positive effect; for the others, the effect was negative. In both of the schools, the CPA was implemented across the entire curriculum for a particular grade. Across the two schools, one-fourth of the teachers responding reported the school had substantially changed its structure, procedures, or curriculum based on the CPA, and half of the teachers reported slight changes. Three-quarters of responding teachers from the two schools felt they needed more school-wide support to successfully implement the CPA in their classrooms.

From the teachers' standpoint, there are certain logistical problems with implementing the CPA across a single grade level. A major problem appears to be not having significant numbers of students in common with other teachers using the CPA. A related concern is that a teacher in a particular academic content area may have classes of students from different grade levels. Also, there are issues pertaining to the storage and management of large numbers of student portfolios. Finally, there are issues pertaining to professional development. Both of the two schools have teaching staffs of 20-25 people. Teacher interviews indicated that participation in the tailoring process generates ownership; for those persons who did not participate, there is a feeling that the program "belongs" to the teachers who tailored the CPA.

Neither of the two schools produced a substantial number of completed portfolios; however, one produced enough to conduct benchmarking scoring to identify exemplars of student work at each score point on the rubric.

In summary, there was general agreement in LCR and HCR schools that the CPA is a valuable tool for implementing standards-based curriculum and assessment school-wide. However, in terms of actually causing, versus supporting, substantial change in structures, procedures, or curriculum, teachers were less conclusive. It appears that in LCR schools, teachers that bought in to the CPA did make changes. LCR teachers that did not buy in, and they appeared to be the majority at LCR schools, did not make changes. At HCR schools, deep structural and classroom changes were less likely as they already had enabling structures in place. On the whole, LCR schools would have had to make alterations school-wide in their structures, procedures, and/or curriculum to engender successful CPA implementation. If LCR schools had been able to change rapidly to create the enabling whole-school structures of the HCR schools (team teaching, shared students, teacher planning time, integrated curriculum, etc.), WestEd staff believe they would have had a good chance of having much greater completion rates.

CONCLUSION

The 1998-1999 CPA effort generated data about the tailored CPA's potential use as a scalable, reliable assessment that supports systemic reform and improves student performance. Major findings from the 1998-1999 project confirmed findings from the 1996-1997 cohort and shed light on the new issue of tailoring. Like the whole of this report, the conclusion is organized around the four research areas of tailoring, implementation, student performance and assessment, and whole-school change.

Tailoring

1. **The tailoring process enabled schools to efficiently customize the CPA to their own needs, thus increasing ownership or "buy-in."** The opportunity to customize the CPA to local needs and standards made a substantial contribution to teacher buy-in, especially for those teachers who were participants in the tailoring process.

2. **The tailoring process appears to have ongoing substantive value, in addition to buy-in.** Three of the four HCR schools revised their portfolio designs at the end of their first year. Similarly, three of the four 1999-2000 schools will revise their portfolio this summer.

3. **Tailoring allowed schools to use the CPA to meet regulatory, as well as curriculum and assessment needs thereby increasing the tailored CPA's value.** California CPA schools that had recently been through or were about to go through the state's accreditation process reported that the state saw great value in the portfolio due to its emphasis on student work targeted at standards.

4. **The tailoring process did not place undue burden on schools.** While the tailoring process did take two days of staff time, the fact that tailoring generally occurred in summer, along with the fact that teachers found the process to be useful in understanding the portfolio, schools generally found the time to be well spent.

5. **Tailoring is integral to long-term scalability.** Tailoring allows schools to fully understand the portfolio, particularly how the standards, entries, and rubric are interdependent and how they link to curriculum. Once schools have this understanding, the portfolio becomes their own, as opposed to a model controlled by an external group. Schools can then modify their tailored portfolio in accordance with evolving content standards and performance levels.

Implementation

1. **The tailored CPA can be implemented successfully in schools possessing certain structural characteristics generally associated with schools that are engaged in whole-school reform**. These characteristics are:
   - recognition of the benefit of standards-based teaching and assessment for students
   - strong teacher buy-in for the CPA as the right vehicle to implement standards-based teaching and assessment
   - strong school leadership
   - commitment to reform
   - whole-school focus by teachers (as opposed to strong focus on individual departments)
   - integrated curriculum
   - interdisciplinary/team teaching
   - block scheduling
   - a shared cohort of students

2. **In CPA pilot tests over four years, these conditions were most prevalent in small schools, or smaller units within schools (e.g., academies, career paths). This suggests that the CPA is most sustainable and scalable in smaller learning environments**. All four of the 1988-1999 HCR schools are small and are committed to using the CPA in the 2000-2001 school year, after WestEd support has ended. Furthermore, of the cohort of four schools that started the CPA in the 1999-2000 school year, and that were chosen with more emphasis on the structural characteristics listed above than the schools chosen for 1998-1999, the three small ones were most successful. (All four will continue to implement in the 2000-2001 school year.)

3. **Like other substantial assessment and curriculum tools that require schools to be well down the reform path, the CPA is not likely to be scalable across a majority of high schools given the current reform status of most high schools**. Most high schools do not possess a preponderance of the conditions listed above, particularly across the entire school. Furthermore, the CPA was notably successful in smaller environments such as academies and has been less successful in larger schools. This is not surprising given the structural characteristics listed above—large schools are less likely than small schools to possess them. Schools not possessing a preponderance of the conditions for success would do well to engender a whole-school (versus departmental) focus, examine why the conditions for success do not exist, and proceed to create the conditions.

4. **As in 1996-1997, survey and interview data from teachers and students were positive about the value of the CPA.** Teachers across disciplines saw value in the CPA. Perhaps as importantly, the schools possessing the conditions for success appear to have institutionalized the CPA to varying degrees. This is important as the tailored CPA requires a major, ongoing effort by teachers and students. Simply put, in schools that are relatively far down the reform path, the only challenging, non-mandated reforms that last are the ones that teachers believe positively impact students.

5. **Scoring large numbers of portfolios challenges schools' ability to provide scorers and could impact scalability**. The 1998-1999 schools scored under 200 portfolios each and had some difficulty in recruiting scorers. The resources necessary to score large numbers of portfolios in single scoring sessions could make meaningful scoring extremely difficult for large schools. Alternative scoring models, such as classroom-based scoring, need to be explored.

Student Performance and Assessment

1. **Reliable scoring of the tailored CPA requires a commitment to conducting scoring with substantial training**. Scoring in the 1998-1999 pilot test occurred in conditions not conducive to high reliability. Not surprisingly, reliability achieved was not sufficient for high-stakes decisions such as graduation requirements or academy certifications based on portfolio quality, as opposed to just portfolio completion. In the 1999-2000 effort, where WestEd staff focused on increasing training time, reliability was higher than in 1998-1999 (a range of 64 percent to 79 percent versus a range of 58 percent to 71 percent). WestEd staff more aggressively communicated the need for reliability to participating schools in 1999-2000. Also in 1999-2000, WestEd staff targeted training at scoring dimensions where it was low in 1998-1999 (e.g., Technology, Analysis).

2. **Student performance on the tailored CPA was acceptable to implementing teachers**. Similar to the 1996-1997 effort, 68 percent of 1998-1999 students who completed portfolios "passed," or received a Proficient or Advanced score, and 32 percent "failed," or received a Basic. 1999-2000 student performance was similar to 1998-1999, with 66 percent of students receiving a Proficient or Advanced score, and 34 percent receiving Basic. These ratios of Proficient/Advanced to Basic have not deterred HCR schools from continuing to implement the CPA.

Whole-school change

1. **A strong majority of 1998-1999 project teachers believe the tailored CPA is a valuable teaching tool that promotes change in classroom practice and can support school-wide reform**. It should be noted that in HCR schools many key structural conditions for successful implementation were already well established at the outset of CPA implementation. There was not the impetus, nor the need, for substantial structural change at these schools. In these schools, the CPA acted as a curricular tool and focus for what students should know and be able to do at the school-wide level, and as an opportunity to implement high quality standards-based curriculum and assessment. For schools not possessing the key conditions, the CPA acted as a litmus test for implementation of any school-wide reform. After attempting to implement the tailored CPA, leaders at LCR schools more clearly understood what structural and attitudinal changes needed to occur.

2. **The tailored CPA allowed and supported "ready" schools to implement their visions related to having a school-wide student performance focus and to standards-based teaching and learning.** One principal of an HCR school stated it most clearly, "The portfolio is the flag in the ground for our vision. It gives our vision definition and helps to make it a classroom reality."

The capacity of any school not possessing a preponderance of the CPA's conditions for success to implement any type of standards-based reform on a school-wide basis is highly questionable. Given that, the fact that the CPA did not fare well in LCR schools should not be surprising or disconcerting. Moreover, that the CPA is flourishing in schools with faculties acutely attuned to innovation and in schools possessing the conditions for success is strong testimony to its value. In our national context where precious few high schools are implementing standards-based reform in more than a few departments, the CPA is an effective tool to help scale standards-based teaching and learning across whole schools and across ready subsets of schools.

Appendix A

Career Preparation Standards

CAREER PREPARATION STANDARDS (CPS)

1. **PERSONAL SKILLS.** Students will understand how personal skill development affects their employability. They will exhibit positive attitudes, self confidence, honesty, perseverance, self-discipline, and personal hygiene. They will manage time and balance priorities as well as demonstrate a capacity for lifelong learning.

2. **INTERPERSONAL SKILLS.** Students will understand key concepts in group dynamics, conflict resolution, and negotiation. They will work cooperatively, share responsibilities, accept supervision, and assume leadership roles. They will demonstrate cooperative working relationships across gender and cultural groups.

3. **THINKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING SKILLS.** Students will exhibit critical and creative thinking skills, logical reasoning, and problem solving. They will apply numerical estimation, measurement, and calculation, as appropriate. They will recognize problem situations; identify, locate, and organize needed information or data; and propose, evaluate, and select from alternative solutions.

4. **COMMUNICATION SKILLS.** Students will understand principles of effective communication. They will communicate both orally and in writing. They will listen attentively and follow instructions, requesting clarification or additional information as needed.

5. **OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY.** Students will understand occupational safety issues including the avoidance of physical hazards in the work environment. They will operate equipment safely so as not to endanger themselves or others. They will demonstrate proper handling of hazardous materials.

6. **EMPLOYMENT LITERACY.** Students will understand career paths and strategies for obtaining employment within their chosen fields. They will assume responsibility for professional growth. They will understand and promote the role of their field within a productive society, including the purpose of professional organizations.

7. **TECHNOLOGY LITERACY.** Students will understand and adapt to changing technology by identifying, learning, and applying new skills to improve job performance. They will effectively employ technologies relevant to their fields.

Appendix B
CPA Rubric

Career Preparation Assessment (CPA) Rating Guide

	CAREER PREPARATION Personal qualities needed for employment Interpersonal skills needed for employment Career planning and employment literacy	ANALYSIS Analytic thinking Evaluation	TECHNOLOGY Presentation of work using technology Application of technology other than word processing	COMMUNICATION Attention to audience Using own ideas Organization and clarity Accuracy and completeness Language mechanics, sentence structure, and vocabulary
BASIC (Not ready to show employer or college)	Does not identify own personal qualities needed to be successfully employed Shows little or no ability to work productively with others Shows little evidence of planning for a career	Reasoning is unclear, illogical, or superficial; interprets or calculates information inaccurately; makes statements with little explanation Gives incomplete or sketchy evaluation of own work	Does not use technology to present work (Appearance interferes with presentation of work) Application of technology other than word processing is ineffective or lacking	Shows little or no awareness of the audience Writing is not original; copies the ideas of others Ideas are presented in a disorganized way Work lacks accuracy and completeness Writing contains errors in language use that make ideas difficult to understand
PROFICIENT (Ready to show employer or college)	Identifies own personal qualities needed to be successfully employed Shows ability to work productively with others Shows evidence of planning and developing a career	Reasoning is clear and logical; interprets or calculates information accurately; supports statements with explanation Gives accurate evaluation of own work	Uses technology to present work Effectively applies technology other than word processing	Effectively presents self and ideas to outside reviewer Writing is original Writing is clear and organized Work is accurate and fully developed Writing contains minor language errors; Ideas are understandable
ADVANCED (Superior quality may exceed expectations of employer or college)	Consistently highlights own personal qualities needed to be successfully employed Shows leadership and strong ability to work productively with others Shows excellent understanding of career planning; describes realistic plan for achieving career	Reasoning is clear, logical and thorough; interprets or calculates information accurately and creatively; supports statements with evidence Shows understanding and insight in evaluating own work	Uses technology to enhance presentation of work Effectively applies technology other than word processing that is relevant to chosen field	Self and ideas "come alive" to outside reviewer Writing is original and may be creative Writing is clear and well organized throughout portfolio Work is accurate and complete with consistent and superior development ; shows attention to detail Writing is almost free of language errors and is easy to understand

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix C

Examples of "Tailored" Rubrics

Alvarez School to Career Assessment (ASCA) Rating Guide

	CAREER PREPARATION • **Personal qualities needed for employment** • **Interpersonal skills needed for employment** • **Career planning and employment literacy**	**ANALYSIS AND PROBLEM SOLVING** • **Analytic thinking** • **Evaluation**	**TECHNOLOGY LITERACY** • **Presentation of work using technology** • **Application of technology other than word processing**	**WRITTEN AND ORAL COMMUNICATION** • **Attention to audience** • **Using own ideas** • **Organization and clarity** • **Accuracy and completeness** • **Language mechanics, sentence structure, and vocabulary**
EMERGING (Not ready to show employer or college)	• Does not identify own personal qualities needed to be successfully employed • Shows little or no ability to work productively with others • Shows little evidence of planning for a career	• Reasoning is unclear, illogical, or superficial; interprets or calculates information inaccurately; makes statements with little explanation or data • Gives incomplete, unrealistic, or biased evaluation of own work	• Does not use technology effectively to present work (Appearance detracts from presentation of work) • Application of technology other than word processing is ineffective or lacking	Written and Oral work shows: • Little or no awareness of the audience • Ideas are not original; copies others • Communication is disorganized • Work lacks accuracy and completeness • Makes errors in language use that make ideas difficult to understand
PROFICIENT (Ready to show employer or college)	• Identifies own personal qualities needed to be successfully employed • Shows ability to work productively with others • Shows evidence of planning and exploring career options	• Reasoning is clear and logical; interprets or calculates information accurately; supports statements with explanation and/or data • Gives realistic and objective evaluation of own work	• Uses technology effectively to present work • Effectively applies technology other than word processing	Written and Oral work shows: • Effectively presents self and ideas to audience • Ideas are original • Communication is clear and organized • Work is accurate and fully developed • Makes minor language errors; ideas are understandable
OUTSTANDING (Superior quality, may exceed expectations of employer or college)	• Consistently highlights own personal qualities needed to be successfully employed • Shows leadership and strong ability to work productively with others • Shows excellent understanding of career planning; describes realistic plan for achieving career goal; shows evidence of exploring additional options	• Reasoning is clear, logical, and thorough; interprets or calculates information accurately and creatively; supports statements with evidence • Shows understanding and insight in evaluating own work	• Uses technology to enhance presentation of work • Effectively applies technology other than word processing that is relevant to chosen field	Written and Oral work shows: • Self and ideas "come alive" to audience • Ideas are original and may be creative • Communication is clear and well organized throughout portfolio • Work is accurate and complete with consistent and superior development; shows attention to detail • Makes almost no language errors and is easy to understand

Professional Skills Assessment (PSA) Rating Guide

	PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION • **Personal skills** • **Interpersonal skills** • **Professional awareness**	**WORK-PLANNING** • **Thinking and problem-solving skills** • **Project management skills**	**TECHNOLOGY SKILLS** • **Making relevant choices about the application of technology** • **Use of technology**	**COMMUNICATION** • **Attention to audience** • **Using own ideas** • **Organization and clarity** • **Accuracy and completeness** • **Language mechanics, sentence structure, and vocabulary**
EMERGING (Not ready to show college or employer)	• Does not identify personal skills needed to be successful professionally • Interpersonal Skills Evaluation shows little evidence of working productively with others • Shows little evidence of professional awareness	• Reasoning is unclear, illogical, or superficial; interprets or calculates information inaccurately; makes statements with little explanation • Needs to show more evidence of the use of project planning skills to set and meet project goals	• Needs to recognize when to apply technology and what to use • Rarely uses technology to perform tasks or enhance work • Relies exclusively on most basic or simple technology tools	Written work and Oral Communication Skills Evaluation show that: • Student needs greater awareness of the audience • Ideas are not complex; copies others • Communication is disorganized • Work needs to be more accurate and complete • Errors in language make ideas difficult to understand
COMPETENT (Ready to show employer or college)	• Identifies own personal skills needed to be successful professionally • Interpersonal Skills Evaluation shows ability to work productively with others • Shows evidence of professional awareness	• Reasoning is clear and logical; interprets or calculates information accurately; supports statements with explanation • Shows evidence of the use of project planning skills to set and meet project goals	• Recognizes when to apply technology and what to use • Uses technology to perform tasks • Competently uses a range of technology tools	Written work and Oral Communication Skills Evaluation show that: • Student effectively presents self and ideas to audience • Ideas are complex • Communication is clear and organized • Work is accurate and fully developed • Though minor language errors are evident, ideas are understandable
OUTSTANDING (Superior quality, may exceed expectations of employer or college)	• Consistently highlights personal skills needed to be successful professionally • Interpersonal Skills Evaluation shows leadership and strong ability to work productively and cooperatively with others • Shows evidence of excellent professional awareness	• Reasoning is clear, logical, and thorough; interprets or calculates information accurately and creatively; supports statements with evidence • Shows strong evidence of the use of project planning skills to set and meet project goals, and evaluation of the effectiveness of the approach	• Fully recognizes when to apply technology and what to use • Uses a variety of technology appropriately and creatively to perform tasks and enhance work • Demonstrates complex use of multiple technology tools	Written work and Oral Communication Skills Evaluation show that: • Self and ideas "come alive" to audience • Ideas are complex and may be creative • Communication is clear and well organized throughout portfolio • Work is accurate and complete with consistent and superior development; shows attention to detail • Almost no language errors are evident

ESLR Assessment Portfolio Rating Guide

	CAREER / COLLEGE PREPARATION • **Interpersonal skills** • **Organization of tasks and resources** • **Career/college planning**	READING / THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING • **Reading for meaning** • **Locating and using information** • **Analytic thinking** • **Self-evaluation and reflection**	TECHNOLOGY • **Presentation of work using technology** • **Application of technology other than word processing**	COMMUNICATION • **Attention to audience** • **Using own ideas** • **Organization and clarity** • **Accuracy and completeness** • **Language mechanics, sentence structure, and vocabulary**
BASIC (Not ready to show employer or college)	• Shows little or no ability to work productively with others • Shows little or no ability to organize tasks and resources • Shows little evidence of planning for a career/college	• Shows little or no ability to infer meaning from details and to describe/paraphrase content • Shows little or no ability to locate and use information • Reasoning is unclear, illogical, or superficial; interprets or calculates information inaccurately; makes statements with little explanation • Gives incomplete or sketchy evaluation of own work	• Does not use technology to present work (Appearance interferes with presentation of work) • Application of technology other than word processing is ineffective or lacking	• Shows little or no awareness of the audience • Writing/work is not original; copies the ideas of others • Ideas are presented in a disorganized way • Writing/work lacks accuracy and completeness • Writing contains errors in language use that make ideas difficult to understand
PROFICIENT (Ready to show employer or college)	• Shows ability to work productively with others • Shows ability to organize tasks and resources • Shows evidence of career/college planning and preparation	• Infers meaning from details or describes/paraphrases content • Shows ability to locate and use information • Reasoning is clear and logical; interprets or calculates information accurately; supports statements with explanation • Accurately evaluates own work	• Uses technology to present work • Effectively applies technology other than word processing	• Effectively presents self and ideas to outside reviewer • Writing/work is original • Writing is clear and organized • Writing/work is accurate and fully developed • Writing contains minor language errors; ideas are understandable
ADVANCED (Superior quality, may exceed expectations of employer or college)	• Shows leadership and strong ability to work productively with others • Shows superior ability to organize tasks and resources • Shows excellent understanding of career/college planning; describes realistic plan for achieving career/college plans	• Connects understanding of text to another piece of writing or prior knowledge/experience • Shows superior ability to locate and use information • Reasoning is clear, logical, and thorough; interprets or calculates information accurately and creatively; supports statements with evidence • Shows understanding and insight in evaluating own work	• Uses technology to enhance presentation of work • Effectively applies technology other than word processing that is relevant to chosen field	• Self and ideas "come alive" to outside reviewer • Writing/work is original and creative • Writing is clear and well organized throughout portfolio • Writing/work is accurate & complete with consistent and superior development; shows attention to detail • Writing is almost free of language errors and is easy to understand

P^3 Rating Guide

	PERSONAL	INTERPERSONAL	THINKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING	COMMUNICATION
	• Positive attitude **• Self-confidence** **• Perseverance** **• Self-reflection**	**Group participation** **Conflict resolution** **Negotiation** **Cooperative working relationships** **Shared responsibility** **Acceptance of supervision** **Assuming leadership**	**• Critical and creative thinking** **• Logical reasoning** **• Problem solving** **• Numerical estimation, measurement, and calculation** **• Identifying, locating and organizing relevant information** **• Proposing, evaluating and selecting solutions**	**• Listens actively and follows instructions, requesting clarification as needed** **• Accuracy and completeness** **• Using own ideas** **• Organization and clarity** **• Language usage** **• Oral communication**
DEVELOPING (Not ready to show employer or college)	• Does not demonstrate the individual's personal skills needed to be successfully employed	• Shows little or no ability to work productively with others	• Critical and creative thinking skills are undeveloped • Logical reasoning is not evident • Problem solving is incomplete • Numerical estimation, measurement and calculation is inappropriate or incorrect • Relevant information or data is not identified • Solutions are inappropriate or inaccurate	• Demonstrates difficulty following instructions and fails to request clarification when needed • Work lacks accuracy and is incomplete • Ideas are presented in a disorganized fashion • Writing contains errors in language usage that make ideas difficult to understand • Oral presentation is disorganized and lacks accuracy and completeness
PROFICIENT (Ready to show employer or college)	• Demonstrates the individual's personal skills needed to be successfully employed	• Shows ability to work productively with others	• Critical and creative thinking skills are developed • Logical reasoning is evident • Problem solving is complete • Numerical estimation, measurement and calculation is appropriate and/or correct • Relevant information or data is identified • Solutions are appropriate and accurate	• Student follows instructions and request clarification when needed • Work is accurate and complete • Ideas are presented in an organized fashion • Writing contains minor errors in language usage but ideas are understandable • Oral presentation is organized, accurate and complete
ADVANCED (Superior quality, may exceed expectations of employer or college)	• Demonstrates leadership in the area of personal skills and productively demonstrates these to others	• Shows leadership and strong ability to work productively with others	• Critical and creative thinking skills are highly developed • Logical reasoning is clearly evident • Problem solving is insightful • Numerical estimation, measurement and calculation is appropriate, complete and thorough • Relevant information or data is clearly identified and appropriate • Strong solutions are clearly evident	• Writing demonstrates original thought and creativity • Work is accurate, complete, and shows attention to detail • Shows consistent and superior thought development • Writing is free of language errors, and is easy to understand • Oral presentation demonstrates original thought and creativity, and is of superior quality

	EMPLOYMENT LITERACY • **Selection and design of career paths** • **Promotion of role of field including professional organizations** • **Occupational safety**	**TECHNOLOGY LITERACY** • **Selection of appropriate technology** • **Application of technology relevant to chosen field**	**MAKING CONNECTIONS** • **Applies knowledge and skills from various disciplines** • **Develops strategies and solutions to real world situations**
DEVELOPING (Not ready to show employer or college)	• Identifies a career with little or no awareness of the career path • Does not identify professional organizations within a chosen field • Unaware of safety issues related to a chosen career	• Does not identify the appropriate technology for projects or work • Does not use technology to present work •	• Shows ability to work productively in different disciplines • Shows some ability to solve problems in class and in the real world • Work shows minimal accuracy and completeness
PROFICIENT (Ready to show employer or college)	• Identifies a career and develops a pathway to it • Identifies professional organizations within a chosen field • Identifies occupational safety issues within a chosen career	• Identifies the appropriate technology for projects or work • Effectively applies technology other than word-processing to present work •	• Effectively uses different disciplines to work productively • Applies solutions and strategies successfully • Work is accurate and complete
ADVANCED (Superior quality, may exceed expectations of employer or college)	• Identifies a career and designs an individual pathway to it • Involved in professional organizations within a chosen field • Demonstrates competency in occupational safety within a chosen career	• Uses technology to enhance presentation of projects or work • Effectively applies technology other than word processing that is relevant to chosen field •	• Demonstrates integration from various disciplines • Develops solutions and strategies to real world situations • Work is accurate and complete with consistent and superior development, and shows attention to detail

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix D

Examples of "Tailored" Standards

Alvarez School to Career Skills

Overview

The Alvarez School to Career Skills (ASCS) state the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully develop your career. You will need to strengthen these skills to succeed in advanced education, training, and on the job. Because achieving and demonstrating the ASCS is critical to completing your ASCA portfolio, you need to know the ASCS well.

1. Personal Skills

Good personal skills are very important in school and in work. Instructors and employers expect you to be responsible, self-disciplined, professional, and able to manage your priorities well. In addition, they expect you to be free from substance abuse and to dress in a professional manner. Honesty and personal integrity are also expected on any job.

Examples of personal skills include:

- ethical behavior — do what you know is right even when it is not the easiest choice
- perseverance — complete a task even when it is difficult
- time management — meet deadlines and arrive to appointments on time

2. *Interpersonal Skills*

Today's classrooms and workplaces require that you be able to work as part of a team. You need to be able to work cooperatively with people of different ages and cultural backgrounds. When working with others it is important to understand how to resolve conflicts, negotiate, share responsibilities, accept supervision, and assume leadership roles.

Examples of interpersonal skills include:

- leadership — assign work and inspire co-workers to complete tasks
- following — accept a decision and help meet a goal
- teamwork — use group planning and goal-setting techniques to solve problems

3. *Analysis and Problem-Solving Skills*

There are many ways to solve a problem. Good analysis and problem-solving skills will help you contribute solutions on the job. Employers and colleges will expect you to be able to think analytically and creatively, use logical reasoning, and interpret information. You may need to apply skills such as numerical estimation, measurement, calculation, and evaluation to solve problems.

Examples of analysis and problem-solving skills include:

- problem definition — recognize a problem and identify the relevant facts
- analysis — gather and evaluate information
- decision making — identify and compare possible solutions, and choose the most appropriate

4. *Written Communication Skills*

Strong written communication skills are very important for school, for most jobs, and will help you in your job search. You must be able to read and write effectively. Effective writing means that you can: organize information, clearly present your own ideas, write with your audience in mind, and use correct grammar and spelling.

Examples of written communication skills include:

- composing — write effectively, using good sentence structure and vocabulary
- editing — revising what you have written to improve clarity and/or organization of ideas
- presentation — know who the reader is and communicate written ideas effectively to your audience

5. *Oral Communication Skills*

Oral communication skills are very useful in school and are of particular importance when entering and advancing in a career. In an interview and on the job, you will need to present information and ideas effectively.

Examples of oral communication skills include:

- knowing your audience — anticipate the previous knowledge of your audience and provide the information they will need
- presenting information — speak clearly to convey your ideas to others; introduce information in a logical order
- using audio/visual aids — provide graphics or visuals which enhance your message

6. Employment Literacy

Due to the changing demands of the job market, you need to have a good understanding of career paths and how to find jobs in your chosen field. It is important for you to develop a career plan that describes your goals and plan of action. In order to develop a career plan, you need information about yourself, requirements for education or training, and the job market.

Examples of employment literacy include:

- knowledge of your skills — be aware of personal strengths, weaknesses, interests and abilities, and how they relate to specific career areas
- awareness of the job market — research current trends in the job market, such as jobs that are in high or low demand
- knowledge of career paths — investigate possible careers and entry-level positions with potential for growth

7. Technology Literacy

Many jobs require computer skills, technical knowledge, and the ability to learn and adapt to new technologies. Employers expect you to be able to use technology to complete tasks and to improve your job performance.

Examples of technology literacy include:

- computer skills — select and use appropriate hardware and software
- audio and video skills — use audio and video equipment to document events effectively
- technical knowledge — solve a problem based on your knowledge of technology

Professional Skills Standards

Overview

The Professional Skills Standards (PSS) state the knowledge and skills necessary for success beyond high school. You will need to strengthen these skills to succeed in advanced education, training, and on the job. Because achieving and demonstrating the PSS is critical to completing your PSA portfolio, you need to know the PSS well. The seven skills cover:

1. Personal Skills
2. Interpersonal Skills
3. Thinking and Problem-Solving Skills
4. Communication Skills
5. Project Management
6. Professional Awareness
7. Technology Skills

Each standard is described in detail below.

1. Personal Skills

Students will understand how personal skill development affects their employability. They will exhibit positive attitudes, self confidence, integrity, perseverance, self-discipline, responsibility, and craftsmanship. They will manage time and balance priorities as well as demonstrate a capacity for growth, development and self-reflection.

2. Interpersonal Skills

Students will understand key concepts in group dynamics, conflict resolution, and negotiation. They will work cooperatively, share responsibilities, accept supervision, and assume leadership roles. They will demonstrate cooperative working relationships across gender and cultural groups.

3. Thinking and Problem-Solving Skills

Students will exhibit critical and creative thinking skills, logical reasoning, and problem-solving. They will understand systems. They will apply numerical estimation, measurement, and calculation, as appropriate. They will recognize problem situations; identify, locate, and organize needed information or data; and propose, evaluate, and select from alternative solutions.

4. Communication Skills

Students will understand principles of effective communication. They will communicate both orally and in writing to a range of audiences in a variety of ways. They will listen actively and follow instructions, requesting clarification or additional information as needed.

5. Project Management Skills

Students will understand and use project planning skills. They will set goals and develop strategies to meet those goals in a timely manner. They will acquire and use information and resources to implement their strategies. They will evaluate the effectiveness of their approach.

6. Professional Awareness

Students will understand the necessary skills, educational requirements, and professional opportunities in chosen fields.

7. Technology Skills

Students will know when it is appropriate to use technology, what technology to use, and how to use it to perform tasks and enhance their work.

Pride Standards

Overview

The Pride Standards state the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully develop your career. You will need to strengthen these to succeed in advanced education, in training, and on the job. Because achieving and demonstrating the Pride Standards is critical to completing your P^3, you need to know the standards well. The seven standards are:

1. *Personal Standard*

Students will exhibit how personal development affects their employability, including positive attitudes, self-confidence, honesty, perseverance, self-discipline, social responsibility, and personal hygiene. They will manage time and resources, balance priorities, and demonstrate a capacity for self-reflection and lifelong learning.

2. *Interpersonal Standard*

Students will participate in group dynamics, conflict resolution, and negotiation. They will work cooperatively, share responsibilities, accept supervision, and assume leadership roles. They will demonstrate cooperative working relationships across gender and cultural groups.

3. *Thinking and Problem-Solving Standard*

Students will exhibit critical and creative thinking, logical reasoning, and problem-solving. They will apply numerical estimation, measurement, and calculation, as appropriate. They will recognize problem situations; identify, locate, and organize relevant information or data; and propose, evaluate, and select from alternative solutions.

4. *Communication Standard*

Students will demonstrate the use of the principles of effective communication. They will communicate both orally and in writing. They will listen actively and follow instructions, requesting clarification or additional information as needed.

5. *Employment Literacy*

Students will select and design career paths and strategies for obtaining employment within their chosen fields. Students will demonstrate occupational safety including the avoidance of physical hazards in the work environment. They will assume responsibility for professional growth. They will promote the role of their field within a productive society, and understand the purpose of professional organizations.

6. *Technology Literacy*

Students will demonstrate the ability to select the appropriate technologies and effectively employ those technologies to their chosen fields.

7. *Making Connections*

Students will demonstrate the ability to apply knowledge and skills from across disciplines to develop strategies for, and solutions to, real world situations.

NTHS Learning Outcomes

Overview

The NTHS Learning Outcomes state the knowledge and skills necessary for success beyond high school. You will need to strengthen these skills to succeed in advanced education, training, or the work place. Because achieving and demonstrating the Learning Outcomes is critical to completing your Graduation Portfolio, you need to know the Learning Outcomes well. The eight Learning Outcomes are:

1. Technology Literacy
2. Citizenship and Ethics
3. Critical Thinking
4. Career Preparation
5. Collaboration
6. Written Communication
7. Oral Communication
8. Curricular Literacy

Each outcome is described in detail below.

1. *Technology Literacy*

Many jobs require computer skills, technical knowledge, and the ability to learn and adapt to new technologies. Employers expect you to be able to use technology to complete tasks and to improve your job performance.

Examples of technology literacy include:

- typing skills — type 40 WPM with 90% accuracy
- software skills — 80% accuracy in presentation software, word processing, spreadsheet, database, and animation modules

- multimedia skills — create a project that incorporates sound, animation, and interactivity
- technology communication skills — create web pages and gather information from the internet and a variety of technological media

2. *Citizenship and Ethics*

Being successful does not only pertain to academic or financial achievement. The most successful individuals are those who also purposely contribute to their community and conscientiously do what they know is right, even when it is not the easiest choice.

Examples of citizenship and ethics include:

- student government — get involved in important school decisions
- service learning/volunteering — donate time and energy to support a cause that needs your help
- peer tutoring — help a fellow student understand coursework you have mastered

3. *Critical Thinking*

There are many ways to solve a problem. Good thinking and problem-solving skills will help you contribute solutions on the job. Employers and colleges will expect you to be able to think analytically and creatively, use logical reasoning, and interpret information. You may need to apply skills such as numerical estimation, measurement, calculation, and evaluation to solve problems.

Examples of thinking and problem-solving skills include:

- problem definition — recognize a problem and identify the relevant facts
- organization — identify and gather information needed to solve a problem
- analysis — evaluate and select information, and consider possible solutions to a problem

4. *Career Preparation*

In order to prepare for a career, you need to learn responsibility, self-discipline, and time management. Honesty and personal integrity are also expected on any job. In addition, it is important to have a good understanding of career paths and how to find jobs in your chosen field. You will develop a career plan that describes your goals and plan of action. In order to develop a career plan, you need to compile information about yourself, information about requirements for education or training, and information about the job market.

Examples of career preparation include:

- positive attitude and perseverance — willingly follow directions, take on tasks and responsibilities, complete a task even when it is difficult
- flexibility and initiative — adapt to change, apply your knowledge
- knowledge of your skills — be aware of personal strengths, weaknesses, interests and abilities, and how they relate to specific career areas
- knowledge of career paths — investigate possible careers and entry-level positions with potential for growth

5. *Collaboration*

Today's classrooms and workplaces require that you be able to work as part of a team. You need to be able to work cooperatively with people of different ages and cultural backgrounds. When working with others it is important to understand how to resolve conflicts, negotiate, share responsibilities, accept supervision, and assume leadership roles.

Examples of collaboration include:

- leadership — assign work and inspire co-workers to complete tasks
- following — accept a decision and help meet a goal
- teamwork — use group planning and goal-setting techniques to solve problems

6. *Written Communication*

Strong written communication skills are important in school, in the job search, and finally in most jobs. You must be able to read and write effectively. Effective writing means that you can: organize information, clearly present your own ideas, write with your audience in mind, and use correct grammar and spelling.

Examples of written communication skills include:

- composing — write effectively, using good sentence structure and vocabulary
- editing — revising what you have written to improve clarity and/or organization of ideas
- presentation — know who the reader is and communicate written ideas effectively to your audience

7. *Oral Communication*

Oral communication skills are very useful in school and are of particular importance when entering and advancing in a career. In an interview and on the job, you will need to present information and ideas effectively.

Examples of oral communication skills include:

- knowing your audience — anticipate the previous knowledge of your audience and provide the information they will need
- presenting information — speak clearly to convey your ideas to others; introduce information in a logical order
- using audio/visual aids — provide graphics or visuals which enhance your message

8. *Curricular Literacy*

In addition to the life skills outlined above, the State of California and New Technology High School have identified key knowledge that students should have when they graduate from high school. Your academic coursework was designed to provide the educational foundations that will foster informed perspectives and a level of cultural literacy sufficient for success beyond high school. Therefore, your Graduation Portfolio should include evidence of your curricular literacy in as many areas as possible.

Examples of curricular literacy skills include:

- earning a certificate of proficiency (COP) — demonstrate your knowledge by earning a COP in each of your academic courses
- succeeding on standardized tests — earn a score of "school recognition" or better on Golden State Exams or a score of 3 or better on Advanced Placement Exams

Appendix E

Data Collection Instruments

STUDENT SURVEY, 1998-99

Professional Skills Assessment Portfolio (PSAP)

This is a survey about the Professional Skills Assessment Portfolio (PSAP) that you have been involved in this year. Because the Professional Skills Assessment Portfolio (PSAP) is new, we are collecting information to help improve it. Please answer the survey questions as honestly and completely as you can. Your feedback is critical to us! Thank you for your time and thoughtfulness.

1. Age: (circle one)

   13 14 15 16 17 18 19

2. Grade: (circle one)

   9 10 11 12

3. Gender: (circle one)

   Male Female

4. Ethnicity: (circle one)
   a. American Indian
   b. Asian
   c. Pacific Islander
   d. Filipino
   e. Hispanic
   f. Black
   g. White
   h. Other (please describe): ________________
   i. Decline to state

5. Name of the class or classes where you worked on the Professional Skills Assessment Portfolio (PSAP).

   a. ________________
   b. ________________
   c. ________________
   d. ________________
   e. ________________

6. Did you complete all the entries in the PSAP (Personal Statement, Résumé, Application, Letter of Recommendation, to Work Samples, Writing Sample, Interpersonal Skills Evaluation, Oral Communication Skills Evaluation)? (circle one)

   Yes No

ABOUT THE PROFESSIONAL SKILLS STANDARDS (PSS)

DIRECTIONS: Please circle the response that most closely corresponds to how much you agree with each of the statements in the survey.

The Professional Skills Standards (Personal, Interpersonal, Thinking and Problem-Solving, Communication, Project Management, Professional Awareness; Technology) are the skills the PSAP measures.

7. I understood the Professional Skills Standards (PSS).

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

8. My teachers spent enough time explaining the PSS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

9. Employers will hire people who have the PSS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

10. Colleges will admit students who have the PSS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

11. Having the PSS will help me in the future.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know

12. My teachers think it is important for me to learn the PSS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

13. The PSAP is a good way to learn and master the PSS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

14. I know when I have mastered the PSS.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

ABOUT COMPLETING THE PSAP

15. I understood how to do the entries that make up the PSAP (Personal Statement, Résumé, Application, Letter of Recommendation, to Work Samples, Writing Sample, Interpersonal Skills Evaluation, Oral Communication Skills Evaluation).

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

16. Overall, I received all the information, help, and support I needed to be successful in doing the PSAP.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

17. I received a copy of the PSAP "Guidelines For Students."

Yes   No

18. If you answered "Yes" to #17, were the PSAP "Guidelines For Students" useful? (If you answered "No" to #17, skip this question and go to #19.)

Yes   No

19. Doing the PSAP will help me in the future.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree   Do Not Know

20. I recommend that other students do the PSAP.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

ABOUT THE VALUE OF YOUR PSAP

21. Having the PSAP will help me get a job.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree   Do Not Know

22. Having the PSAP will help me get into college.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree   Do Not Know

23. I learn and master the PSS better in classes where I use the PSAP than in classes where I do not use the PSAP.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

24. Working on the PSAP entries helps to improve my academic work.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

25. Teachers who use the PSAP teach differently than teachers who do not use the PSAP.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

26. Teachers who use the PSAP ask me to do different kinds of assignments than teachers who do not use the PSAP.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

27. My teachers thought the PSAP was important.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

28. The PSAP is a good teaching and learning tool.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

ABOUT IMPROVING THE PSAP

29. If you were the teacher, how would you change the PSAP? (Circle as many as you wish.)

    a. I would make no changes.

    b. I would devote more time to explaining how to do the PSAP.

    c. I would allow more class time for students to work on the PSAP.

    d. I would provide more examples to guide the students' work.

    e. Other. (Please explain)

Please write on the back of this page if you need more room.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!!

TEACHER SURVEY, 1998-99

Professional Skills Assessment (PSA)

This is a survey about the Professional Skills Assessment (PSA). Because the PSA is new, we are collecting information to help guide its development. Your feedback in this survey is critical to the PSA. Please answer as honestly and completely as you can. You should be able to complete this survey in 15 minutes or less. When you have completed the survey, please give it to Bob Lenz.

ABOUT YOUR TEACHING AND CLASSES

1. How long have you been teaching?

   0-1 years   2-3 years   4-9 years   10 or more years

2. Have you ever implemented a portfolio before the PSA?

   Yes   No

3. What subjects do you currently teach (circle all that apply)?

   Agriculture
   Business
   Career Awareness/Dev.
   Computer Science
   Construction/Engineering
   Economics
   English
   Foreign Language
   Health
   Math
   Science
   Social Studies/History
   Other (please describe): ____________________

4. In which subject(s) did you use the PSA?

   1. ______________ 2. ______________ 3. ______________

5. In how many of your classes did you use the PSA?

   1   2   3   4   5

6. In the classes where you used the PSA, what percentage of class time was devoted exclusively to the PSA? ____%

7. In your classes where students were supposed to work on the PSA, what percentage:

______ completed all entries of the PSA

______ only completed some entries of the PSA

______did not complete any entries of the PSA, but attempted some entries

______did not attempt any entries of the PSA

(Percentages must total 100.)

8. Did your students receive PSA Student Guidelines? ______yes ______no

9. To what extent did the Guidelines help students do the PSA entries?

Very helpful Somewhat helpful Slightly helpful Not helpful

10. In what month did you introduce the Professional Skills Standards (PSS) to your students?

Sept. Oct. Nov. Dec. Jan. Feb. Mar. Apr. May

11. In what month did your students begin to create their first PSA entry?

Sept. Oct. Nov. Dec. Jan. Feb. Mar. Apr. May

12. Student performance on the PSA was counted toward the following (circle all that apply):

a. a percentage of the semester grade in my class(es)
(estimate the percentage _____)

b. a percentage of the semester grade in other classes
(estimate the percentage _____)

c. graduation requirement

d. academy certification

e. none of the above

f. other (Please describe)____

____

____

g. don't know

ABOUT THE PROFESSIONAL SKILLS STANDARDS (PSS) AND PSA OVERALL

The following are a series of statements about the PSA. Please circle the response which best shows how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

13. The school administration or teacher leadership communicated the purpose of the PSA clearly.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

14. Teachers and administrators in my school have a strong commitment to the PSA/PSS.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

15. The PSA is important for my students.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

16. My students were motivated and interested in participating in the PSA.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

17. The Professional Skills Standards (PSS) represent skills valued by employers.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

18. The PSS represent skills valued by post-secondary educational institutions.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

19. The PSA is a valuable assessment tool for me.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

20. The PSA assesses the PSS well.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

21. Doing the PSA is a good way for students to learn or master the PSS.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

22. Using the PSA improves students' academic work.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

23. PSAs are of interest to employers.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

24. PSAs are of interest to post-secondary educational institutions.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

25. Using PSAs is, or could be, a valuable support for implementing standards-based curriculum and assessment schoolwide.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

26. I would like to receive PSA scoring data on my students.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

27. I intend to continue using the PSA next year.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

28. In this school, I am able to structure my curriculum as I choose.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

For statements 29 through 33, circle the response that indicates the extent to which the PSA led to changes in your school.

29. I used the PSS to structure my curriculum.

Very substantially Substantially Slightly Not at all

30. Using the PSS led me to alter or rethink my teaching methods.

Very substantially Substantially Slightly Not at all

31. Using the PSA as a means of organizing student work led me to alter or rethink my teaching methods.

Very substantially Substantially Slightly Not at all

32. Seeing student efforts for the PSA led me to alter or rethink my teaching methods.

Very substantially Substantially Slightly Not at all

33. Our school or program has changed its structure, procedures, or curriculum based on PSA related student work.

Very substantially Substantially Slightly Not at all

34. What factors or resources contributed to the success of the PSA in your classroom? Please circle the 5 **most important** factors.

a. Integrated curriculum
b. Previous experience with standards-based assessment
c. Previous experience with performance-based assessment
d. Block scheduling
e. Significant numbers of students in common with other teachers using the PSA
f. Team teaching
g. Career academies
h. Professional development related to the PSA
i. More class time for the PSA
j. More experience with the PSS
k. More experience with the PSA
l. PSA Student Guidelines
m. Students with more experience with portfolios
n. More parent understanding of portfolios
o. More schoolwide support of the PSS
p. More schoolwide support of the PSA
q. Other (Please list): ______________________________

35. What factors or resources that you did not have this past year would have made the PSA more successful in your classroom? Please circle the 5 **most important** factors.

a. Integrated curriculum
b. Previous experience with standards-based assessment
c. Previous experience with performance-based assessment
d. Block scheduling
e. Significant numbers of students in common with other teachers using the PSA
f. Team teaching
g. Career academies
h. More professional development related to the PSA
i. Different professional development related to the PSA than we received
j. More class time for the PSA
k. More experience with the PSS
l. More experience with the PSA
m. Different PSA Student Guidelines
n. Students with more experience with portfolios
o. More parent understanding of portfolios
p. More schoolwide support of the PSS
q. More schoolwide support of the PSA
r. Other (Please list): ____

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR THE PSA

This section is designed to gather information about the professional development that you received for the PSA, now that you have worked with it. Please circle the response that best shows how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

After the PSA professional development workshops, I understood:

36. the purposes of the PSA.

Strongly agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly disagree

37. the PSS.

Strongly agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly disagree

38. the entries in the PSA.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

39. the nature of tasks that elicit work demonstrating the PSS.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

40. how to judge when student work demonstrates the PSS.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

41. how to use the PSA rubric.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

42. how to design assignments which help students demonstrate the PSS.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

43. how to integrate the PSA into my curriculum plans.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

44. Overall, the workshops prepared me adequately to implement the PSA in my classes.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

45. I could have been better prepared to implement the PSA if more time had been devoted to professional development from WestEd.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

46. I could have been better prepared to implement the PSA if the professional development from WestEd had been of higher quality.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

CREATED/TAILORED PORTFOLIO

47. Were you aware that the PSA was created/tailored specifically for use in your school by teachers from your school working with WestEd staff?

Yes No

48. If yes, did you participate in this process?

Yes No

49. How many other teachers in your school who used the PSA in their classes do you think were aware that the program was created/tailored specifically for use in your school?

Almost all Many Some Almost none

50. The PSA measures standards already in use in my curriculum.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

51. Other comments:

SCORER SURVEY, 1998-99

This is a survey about the scoring/benchmarking of the portfolios. We are collecting information to help in the improvement of the process. Your feedback in this survey is very important. Please answer as honestly and completely as you can. You should be able to complete this survey in 10 minutes or less. When you have completed the survey, please give it to the WestEd staff member leading your scoring/benchmarking event.

1. Name of School____

2. Please circle the category that describes you.

   a. Teacher who implemented the portfolio
   b. Teacher who **did not** implement the portfolio
   c. Site administrator
   d. District administrator
   e. Parent
   f. Employer
   g. Other (please specify:________________________________)

Please circle the response that best shows how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

3. Scoring/benchmarking the portfolios was a valuable experience.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

4. After scoring/benchmarking, I am better prepared to help my students produce Proficient portfolios.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree   N/A

5. Scoring/benchmarking students' portfolios increased my knowledge of how well those students have mastered the portfolio's standards.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

6. The **time** devoted to training for scoring/benchmarking the portfolios was adequate.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

7. The **content** of the training I received to prepare me for scoring/benchmarking the portfolios was adequate.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

8. I feel confident that the school will be able to effectively conduct portfolio scoring/benchmarking next year **without** assistance/training from WestEd.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

9. The scoring rubric has the right number of performance levels (It currently has three—Basic, Proficient and Advanced).

Yes	No

10. If you answered "No" to question 9, how many performance levels should the rubric have?

2	4	5	6

11. Overall, the time and effort the school invested in scoring/benchmarking was worthwhile.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Suggestions for improving portfolio scoring/benchmarking:

THANK YOU FOR SCORING/BENCHMARKING!!!!!

Drake High School
1999

Professional Skills Assessment Portfolio Score Sheet

Student Name

Scoring procedure

1. Read the scoring guide on the back of this sheet
2. Read the portfolio, looking for evidence described in the scoring guide
3. Highlight the scoring guide where the description matches the evidence in the portfolio
4. Assign a score for each dimension
5. Assign an overall score

Comments

Scorer Name

Date

Logged

☐ 1st Score ☐ 2nd Score ☐ 3rd Score	PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION Personal skills Interpersonal skills Professional awareness	WORK-PLANNING Thinking and problem-solving skills Project management skills	TECHNOLOGY SKILLS Making relevant choices about the application of technology Use of technology	COMMUNICATION Attention to audience ,Using own ideas Organization and clarity, Accuracy and completeness, Language mechanics, sentence structure, and vocabulary	OVERALL
EMERGING (Not ready to show college or employer)	• Does not identify own personal skills needed to be successful professionally • Interpersonal Skills Evaluation shows little or no ability to work productively with others • Shows little evidence of professional awareness − ☐ +	• Reasoning is unclear, illogical, or superficial; interprets or calculates information inaccurately; makes statements with little explanation • Shows little evidence of the use of project planning skills to set and meet project goals − ☐ +	• Fails to recognize when to apply technology and what to use • Rarely uses technology to perform tasks or enhance work − ☐ +	Written work and Oral Communication Skills Evaluation show: • Little/ no awareness of audience • Ideas not original; copies others • Communication is disorganized • Work lacks accuracy and completeness • Makes errors in language use that make ideas difficult to understand − ☐ +	− ☐ +
COMPETENT (Ready to show employer or college)	• Identifies own personal qualities needed to be successful professionally • Interpersonal Skills Evaluation shows ability to work productively with others • Shows evidence of professional awareness − ☐ +	• Reasoning is clear and logical; interprets or calculates information accurately; supports statements with explanation • Shows evidence of the use of project planning skills to set and meet project goals − ☐ +	• Recognizes when to apply technology and what to use • Uses technology to perform tasks − ☐ +	Written work and Oral Communication Skills Evaluation show: • Effectively presents self and ideas to audience • Ideas are original • Communication is clear/ organized • Work is accurate and fully developed • Makes minor language errors; ideas are understandable − ☐ +	− ☐ +
OUT-STANDING (Superior quality, may exceed expectations of employer or college)	• Consistently highlights own personal skills needed to be successful professionally • Interpersonal Skills Evaluation shows leadership and strong ability to work productively and cooperatively with others • Shows evidence of excellent professional awareness − ☐ +	• Reasoning is clear, logical, and thorough; interprets or calculates information accurately and creatively; supports statements with evidence • Shows strong evidence of the use of project planning skills to set and meet project goals, and evaluation of the effectiveness of the approach − ☐ +	• Fully recognizes when to apply technology and what to use • Uses a variety of technology appropriately and creatively to perform tasks and enhance work − ☐ +	Written work and Oral Communication Skills Evaluation show: • Self / ideas "come alive" to audience • Ideas are original and may be creative • Communication is clear and well organized throughout portfolio • Work is accurate and complete with consistent and superior development; shows attention to detail • Makes almost no language errors and is easy to understand − ☐ +	− ☐ +